URBAN ADJUDICATION PANEL

NON-WINNIPEG SCHOOL DIVISION NO. 1

COMPENSATORY SUPPORT PROGRAM

MAY 21 & 22, 1987

Manitoba
Education

AGENDA

COMPENSATORY SUPPORT PROGRAM
URBAN ADJUDICATION PANEL

THURSDAY, MAY 21, 1987
FRIDAY, MAY 22, 1987

BLUE BOARD ROOM
124 KING STREET

==

THURSDAY, MAY 21, 1987
9:00 A.M. - 5:00 P.M.

FRIDAY, MAY 22, 1987
9:00 A.M. UNTIL COMPLETED

1) Introduction
   Terms of Reference
2) Dollars Available
3) Review of Minutes of November 17, 1987
4) Projects Requesting 2nd Year Funding
5) Projects Requesting 4th Year Funding
6) Projects Requesting 3rd Year Funding
7) New Projects
8) Special Grants
9) Completed Projects, Updates and Other
   Information

MINUTES

MINUTES

URBAN ADJUDICATION PANEL MEETING

COMPENSATORY SUPPORT PROGRAM

MONDAY, NOVEMBER 17, 1986

9:00 A.M. - 2:30 P.M. **BLUE BOARD ROOM**

In Attendance:	Pauline Clarke	Pat Rowantree - Chair
	Dorothy Neufeld	Juliette Sabot
	Carole Basarab	Suni Matthews
	Sylvia Taylor	Jack King
		Susan Fonseca
		Darlene Neufeld
Unable to Attend:	Ben Zaidman	
	Maria Mealha	
	Anne Jefferson	

1) BUSINESS ARISING FROM MINUTES

TEACHER MENTOR PILOT - JACK

- big issue is confidentiality
- we will only fund Year 1
- Sylvia asked for opinion from the MTS lawyers - they said we would have no problem with confidentiality issue if we fund Year I only
- Jack stated that there will be new teachers partnered with more experienced ones
- Sylvia - re: her quote in the last meeting's minutes - all schools have inner city population
- Jack - would like Panel's direction re: funding this under a PILOT
- Carole - still not comfortable with this proposal
- Sylvia - has no problems with this if they confine themselves to Year I
- Dorothy - has no problems with it, but doesn't know all the ramifications involved
- Pauline - still has some concerns about it - can't quite see the link between this project and Compensatory
- Carole - doesn't see this as a Compensatory Education program
- Sylvia - in response to Carole - said that B.E. Glavin etc. do have strong inner city characteristics
- Carole - this project is compensating for a need in the university

- Pat - pilots tend to be a little more flexible than grants
- Carole - "doesn't mind being outvoted on this, but feels strongly against it"
- Dorothy - is Division committed?
- Jack - many dollars already spent on travel and visitation by River East School Division No. 9
- Pauline - would like to build something into this proposal/pilot
  - would like something to show the effectiveness of this program on teachers
- Pat - put in proviso "that River East be obliged to share the training/results with Winnipeg No. 1
- Carole - would like Otto Toews and person running the program to be available to discuss the project
- Jack - have ME rep on body?
- Pat - will find out if Ed Buller is involved
- Sylvia mentioned that she is sitting on the Panel through the River East Teachers' Association
- Pat - asked Jack to write up a Recommendation sheet for Panel to discuss later this afternoon

ELEMENTARY COUNSELLING

- meeting scheduled for November 27 to come up with recommendations

REGENT PARK - JACK

- resource teacher had written letter that was unacceptable
- now have letter from principal with evaluation plan following
- ongoing need for Jack to be involved with Community Liaison Worker who had to make transition from being aide last year to worker this year
- steering committee set up for these workers
- parent centre opened last week

ELWICK - JACK

- we were looking for letter confirming a matching of funding for position, at September's Adjudication meeting
- letter is in handout
- we are funding 2 half-times in 2 other schools

KEN SEAFORD - EDMUND PARTRIDGE - WEST ST. PAUL - SUE

- Sue had added this information to last meeting's booklet just for Panel's information
- was to represent Seven Oaks final evaluation of program

2) FINANCIAL INFORMATION - SUE

- Susan presented sheets representing 1987 Compensatory funding
- Finance wants us to do all our funding on a calendar year
- we would rather run our programs on a fiscal year
- Pat - creates auditing problems, and there is an element we don't like - no carry-overs mean spending sprees by divisions
- the projects feel they must spend their money by such and such a time. We are telling them not to do so - we will reallocate funds for them instead. Pat and Ed want to work this through with the Deputy Minister.

3) WINNIPEG NO. 1 - RENEWALS

RIVER ELM - JULIETTE

- interim for Year I was circulated in a handout
- note page 3 at bottom - 59.8% increase in Resource Centre use since Parent/Child Centre's opening
- Juliette would recommend putting through a 12-month contract including benefits (which are included in this salary)
- Carole - job description is adequate
- Pat and Panel - very impressed with the usage rate
- Juliette - their doors are always open - Panel is invited to visit

RECOMMENDATION: That M.E. fund in the amount of $27,000 ($24,640 salary and $2,360 materials) with a final evaluation to be received by October 15, 1987.

ST. STEPHEN'S BROADWAY - JOYCE

- interim evaluation - has been found that students who begin with the program stay with the program
- started officially after spring break last year
- ME, Winnipeg No. 1, St. Stephen's Church Board are all involved in this project
- funding last year was set at $69,500
- this year they are requesting $86,800 (includes 2 staff at .8 time)

- Materials - they need fair amount of mimeographing done for correspondence courses
- Sylvia - very interested in this project - very worthwhile. good young mothers (re: Panel Tour Day)
  - also question process of course preparation for the students
- Joyce - they have an academic teacher - curriculum adaptation
- Sylvia - is there a profile done on these students?
- Joyce - teacher was hired to look at where the students are academically
- Pauline - Argyle School has an incremental approach with credit courses - perhaps St. Stephen's could contact Argyle
- Dorothy - sees very much potential in this program
- Carole - the church is very supportive of this program
- Sylvia - networking was seen among the young mothers - very important!

RECOMMENDATION: That M.E. fund $75,000 ($72,320 salary and $2,680 materials) for the calendar year January-December, 1987. That the program be directed to develop linkages with Argyle School. Final evaluation to be submitted by October 15, 1987. That St. Stephen's Broadway provide the rent for the continuation of the program; maintain the facilities for as long as the program is housed there; and provide volunteer commitment to the program.

VERTICAL INTEGRATED PROJECT - HUGH JOHN MACDONALD - SUNI

- difficulty from onset - participation from the 2 schools minimal
- first year of project - 2 schools (HJM and Pinkham) actually involved
- Victoria-Albert and Dufferin indicated their withdrawal - only 3 major activities occured:
  1) visitation
  2) oral language workshop
  3) summer writing workshop - 3 schools participated (Pinkham, HJM, Dufferin) - were to prepare a unit with oral language thrust
- to date, Suni has only received one completed project
- September '86 report - organization was altered
- Suni met with them - suggested that they submit a new proposal
- Suni - lack of direction/focus - handed out her recommendation.
  - difficult to get breakdown of expenditures.
  - suggested that some of remaining monies be reallocated to Multicultural Counselling
- Sylvia - difficult to find out where this project went wrong
- Pauline - dynamics were different when they first started
  - principals changed second year

RECOMMENDATION: That M.E. not fund this proposal beyond November 30, 1986. That M.E. receive copies of all materials produced. That the Division submit a final report by December 15, 1986 which:

1) **assesses the effect of the project on the students;**
2) **indicates the implementation and effectiveness of the 1986 summer writing component;**
3) **includes a final statement of expenditures to November 30, 1986.**

WESTON - WRITING TO READ - SUNI

- visited by Panel on their Tour Day October 3/86
- is funded until the end of December
- request continuation of aide salary
- changes have been made - K students attend every other day for 45 minutes
- teachers had same concerns as Panel had expressed but see some good results
- Carole - found a rigid system, with teachers trying to fit that into a class structure that was not rigid
- Sylvia - evaluation plan will have to be reviewed in light of teacher input
- evaluation plans need to be reviewed regularly so that children do not get tied into something that doesn't work

RECOMMENDATION: That M.E. fund $4,500 to cover .5 aide position to end of project June, 1987. Final evaluation to be submitted April 15, 1987.

4) ED BULLER

Ed Buller, who was present for a portion of the meeting asked for an opportunity to share some thoughts:

RIVER ELM - project opening - impressed with non-educators involved and parent leadership taken.
P.A.P.I.D. - unique that it's held in a church. Doing very important things for adolescent group.
V.I.P. - need to be careful not to view as a failure. What was learned could have a very important value.

Re: Funding Patterns - spoke with Glenn November 14 - he agrees that Compensatory funding has to be looked at differently. Funding patterns cannot follow formula approach.

Weston Project - important to be able to make some conclusions from this project. Can't pull out now and expect to have creditable results.

Work being done through the Panel is terribly important. It's appreciated!

Carole - Panel likes the funding the "old way" better.
Pauline - is there any mechanism that allows other divisions (rural) to benefit/be informed of the good projects going on here?
Ed - not yet - there should be.
Sylvia - looking at Compensatory-type funding for other categorical grants (instead of formula funding)? Feels the results are a substantial improvement over other grants.

Ed - will look at this with Glenn and the Minister (in terms of what Compensatory funding has accomplished in setting a precedent).
Pauline - on behalf of the Division - really appreciates the effort the inner city team has shown.
Pat - thanked Ed for coming in.

5) NON-WINNIPEG NO. 1

JAMESWOOD - TRANSITION - JACK

- Jack - recommend funding from Jan/87 - Dec/87 and they intend to continue funding after that
- Sylvia - concern re: timeline
- Jack - needs are difficult to put in writing. Especially re: military - problem with priorities of St. James School Division, discussed changing of focus to bridging. Use Sept-Dec as an implementation phase.
- Sylvia - what is intent of the program?
  - what will they do from Jan-June/87?
- Jack - large part of work would be backing up documentation, identifying diagnostic tools for assessment - currently have only standardized tests.
- Sylvia - what are resources within the school now?
- Jack - 1 Resource person - severely affected by cuts in contact time with agencies.
- Sylvia - had phoned former principal of Jameswood re: this proposal. Problem is if Armed Forces need personnel, they move them regardless of the kids' problems (i.e. if they are handicapped in any way)

- Carole - interested in the project and aware of the problems
  - doesn't think this proposal will help the problem - it will always be there
  - liaison officer - Armed Forces? Jack - yes
  - is program compatible with principal?
  - are there resources on the Base available?
  - would like to fund as a Pilot for 2 years - set up and work with staff attitude towards the children and their parents.
  - would like to see orientation program for kids and parents.
  - sees this as a Compensatory program
- Sylvia - this school is not working with the military as it should be (or vice versa).
  - need to remember that for a large period in the year, the kids have only one parent (father is away).
  - put more of Division's own support services (i.e. Social Work)
- Pat - what is Division's plan? Include increase in time. Issues here:
  - support service component
  - linkage with Base
  - principal's role
  - program development for parents in the school (parent component)
  - methodology - is it appropriate?

  Require above plan before Panel funds.
- Panel would like to see them hire a graduate of Social Services
- will always be a high needs school
- staff development is important
- there is poverty here (low subsidized housing) - poorly paid
- Pat - perhaps consider changing Stevenson funding in the spring round
  - this has to be a grant because it's a regular school program
  - 18-month grant

RECOMMENDATION: That M.E. fund $20,000 for 18 months ($19,000 personnel, $1,000 materials) for January/87 - June/88 contingent upon receipt of a fully developed plan to include:

a) the establishment of a steering committee including but not limited to staff and parents;
b) the Division confirming that it will review the roles of present in-school support staff and division CGC-type staff;
c) inclusion of parent programs at the school level;
d) inclusion of a staff development plan which includes information regarding the role of the principal;
e) inclusion of a liaison plan with the Department of National Defence;
f) submission of an evaluation plan by January 30, 1987;
g) an interim report submitted by June 30, 1987 and a final evaluation by April 15, 1988.

KING GEORGE V - SCIENCE PROGRAM - JACK

- attempt by principal to meet concerns of Panel
- passed around support letter from U. of Victoria
- this is a one-person proposal - no other staff or parent involvement
- Jack - disappointed with proposal
- should communicate that Panel is not interested in funding.

RECOMMENDATION: That M.E. not fund this proposal and that the Division encourage the development of community/school needs assessment strategies and programs which involve parents and community.

EDMUND PARTRIDGE - JACK

- rather ambitious proposal
- since time of summary sheet publication, have not had contact with school - only with Assistant Superintendent
- would call for 3 full-time teachers and 1 full-time aide
- Sylvia - not too clear on this
  - why do they require 3 teachers in a Learning Centre?
  - most learning centres operate with a master teacher and para-professionals working in the classroom

Panel was aware that this proposal seeks to integrate kids into the classroom again. But why 3 teachers?

- Carole - they're "fixing the kid" instead of working cooperatively with the classroom teacher.
- Sylvia - problem with the model on page 6-36 - is a one-way model - would like to see a revolving door model.
- Pat - summary of this proposal from the Panel?
- Carole - not crazy about 2 teacher equivalent positions. Should use aides and train them.
- Pat - Panel could fund assistants (aides) and Division could cover cost of the teacher.
- Carole - would like us to fund aide positions. Look at how they're delivering their service over the course of the year.
- Panel - funding Materials - $ 1,000
  Aides - $13,000 each

RECOMMENDATION: The Panel supports the concept of re-integration as it applies to this proposal and therefore recommends that M.E. fund 2 teacher aide positions not to exceed $26,000 and $1,000 for materials. An interim report must be submitted by April 15, 1987 and a final evaluation April 15, 1988. Prior to the release of funds, the division must provide an overview of the delivery service model to be used and job descriptions of the funded positions. It is suggested that emphasis be placed on mainstreaming activities.

MARYMOUND - JACK

- high needs school
- are asking for a Life Book and computers
- need to remember that this is a school unlike others
- have 4 computers in designated subject classrooms
- project has potential to meet needs of students
- Dorothy & Carole - like this project and its stress on the future
- Panel - very comfortable with this proposal

RECOMMENDATION: That M.E. fund $9,950.00 as a special pilot grant and that final evaluation and statement of expenditures be received by October 15, 1987.

RIVER EAST S.D. - NEIL CAMPBELL ELEM. GUIDANCE - JACK

- require half-time elementary guidance counsellor
- $20,000.00
- needs defined don't necessarily relate to inner city needs
- River East - fair track record in terms of picking up projects and continuing funding
- principal - very well informed and prepared
- Jack - dealt with #3 in "Program Evaluations" handout
- Pat - community liaison is going very well, therefore would like to set something like that up for next year as well, in area of elementary counselling
- ISSUES: 1) Funding for this proposal on an ongoing basis
  2) Earmarking $ for evaluation
- Sylvia - important that there is Division support
  - should perhaps have gone to B.E. Glavin based on need
- Jack - this position is strictly half-time - no matching
- Sylvia - would like to fund Year I and have Division pick up Year 2
- Pat - we could fund $15,000 and have Division put in $5,000 to show Divison's involvement and support.
- Panel agrees to earmark funds for evaluation purposes
- Carole - have CEDA person involved on community board for Community Liaison program

RECOMMENDATION: That M.E. fund $20,000 for .5 guidance counsellor for one year only (Jan/87 - Dec/87) contingent upon the Division confirming by letter its intent to fund Year 2 of the project and to participate in an M.E. Elementary Counselling program evaluation commencing in September, 1987. That a final evaluation be submitted by October 15, 1987.

- Panel again expressed their appreciation of the Tour Day - they really enjoyed it and found it helpful!

TEACHER MENTOR PILOT - RECOMMENDATION - JACK

- Recommendation was circulated to Panel by Jack

RECOMMENDATION: That M.E. fund the Teacher Mentor Program to $10,000 with the following contingencies:

1) **that the Divison provide M.E. with copies of interim and final evaluation reports; and**
2) **that a commitment is given by the Division to develop a strategy for sharing information and findings with inner city teaching staff including such activities as writing articles, sponsoring forums and attending meetings; and**
3) **that a statement of expenditures and a report on the staff development phase be completed by May 1, 1987.**

FREE STAGE FOR YOUTH - NORWOOD S.D. - KING GEORGE V - SUSAN

- late submission
- recommend to fund Jan-Dec/87
- was a pilot several years ago and now would like a grant
- cannot find funding elsewhere
- are asking $5,000.00
- Sylvia - any effort to have professional entertainers perform for free?
- Sue - these professionals need their money
  - would like to fund in part and have Kinsmen or some other service clubs fund the remaining
- Pauline - if we fund - would be last time
- Sue - could have Core Area Initiative Education Development fund
- Panel - fund as a grant for $3,000.00 conginent upon them approaching service clubs for remaining funding.

RECOMMENDATION: Panel recommends funding $3,000 one year only contingent upon the Division securing the remaining $2,000 necessary for the implementation of the program and a final report with a statement of expenditures submitted at the conclusion of the pilot.

6) WINNIPEG NO. 1

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT - SUNI

a) School Visitation $4,800 - should be given specific objectives on what to look for during these visitations.
   - which six schools to participate? Should be the central inner city schools.
   - six schools that the teachers will come out of, but where they will visit has not yet been identified.

RECOMMENDATION: That M.E. fund this as a pilot program in the amount of $4,800 contingent upon the following:
   a) that 6 inner city schools be identified to participate in the program, two teachers per school, total of 4 days each;
   b) that pre/post-visitation plan be developed for each school site;
   c) an evaluation plan be submitted, which will specifically determine impact and effectiveness on successful teaching strategies/resources/practices between classroom teachers.

b) Inner City Conference $4,000 - our dollars shouldn't be used for substitute costs for non-inner city teachers. There has been some discussion.
   - Carole - if we fund, specify that it doesn't need to be in spring. Should take more time if it'll make a better conference.

RECOMMENDATION: That M.E. fund this proposal based on the following contingencies:
   a) that a conference committee be struck and that M.E. staff play an integral role in conference planning;
   b) that the Conference Planning Committee submit a detailed budget breakdown prior to release of funds;
   c) that there is a role for the involvement of paraprofessionals as participants;
   d) that no funds be allocated to cover substitute costs of non-inner city teachers;
   e) that a full accounting of expenditures be submitted upon completion.
Adjudication Panel recognizes time constraints in planning a spring conference and would support a fall implementation date.

c) Special Needs - need schools identified

RECOMMENDATION: Panel recommends funding in light of the findings of the evaluation of April 19, 1986. That M.E. staff be involved. That Division submit a final report upon completion which includes a statement of expenditures.

d) Secondary Alternative Teachers - need schools identified

RECOMMENDATION: Panel supports this concept in principle but defers the proposal pending submission of:

1) carefully developed plan, e.g. schools identified, programs to be included, outcomes, process for evaluation;
2) an evaluation plan.

e) Orientation for Teachers New to the Inner City - other avenues where this could be done e.g. schools, WTA...
  - Pauline - want to provide support services in effort to be more organized and to emphasize professional development.
- Carole - difficulty with the 2 days for school visitations.
  - would see it as opportunity to fund development of a model.
  - would like to see M.E. input as to how model is developed.
  - would like to fund in some way.
- Pat - would recommend funding it as a grant.
- Sylvia - sees it as a good initiative - but it should be a process.
- Pat - should approve this in principle and bring back again in spring with changes made.
- should ME have a role in development of a model?
- Do paraprofessionals have a role in this? (Pat would like to see the Division take this issue up separately). Need more aide training.

Add:

Teacher Aide Training (highlight as a separate issue)
- is ME involvement acceptable?
- Pauline - it would have to be sub-committeed

RECOMMENDATION: That the Division develop a collaborative planning model for staff development in order to promote broad based involvement and participation in this initiative and further that this process include plans for orientation of teachers and administrators new to the inner city. Panel recommends that the Superintendents' Inner City Committee have responsibility for the development of the planning model, with support from M.E. staff.

This staff development proposal to be submitted in April, 1987 for fall implementation.
Further, Panel recommends that the Division complement this effort with the development of an Inner City Teacher Aide Training Model, and M.E. staff be directed to support and be involved in planning such an effort.

ESY - JULIETTE

- request that we fund salary for half-time administrative assistant to the end of the project.

RECOMMENDATION: That M.E. fund $7,898.00 ($6,398.00 for .5 Administrative Assistant salary and $1,500.00 materials) for the 1987 calendar year. That M.E. earmark $7,056.00 for the Fall, 1987 Adjudication round to cover administrative assistant salary to Early School Years Project pilot completion in August, 1988.

CHILD GUIDANCE CLINIC - INDIGENOUS WORKERS - SUE

- Core Area - Training & Employment trained 2 workers 2 yrs. ago
- Education Development picked up salaries for 2 workers for first year after graduation.
- Division asking us to fund salary costs and travel allowance until end of school year.
- Sue - would recommend funding to end of June with Division picking up cost again next year.
- Pauline - thought there would be funding on a school year basis, not a calendar year, which is reason for funding requested until June.
- Carole - how do CGC and Winnipeg No. 1 interact?
- Pauline - it's shared funding, but Winnipeg No. 1 manages it. These positions are seen as connected to the CGC.
- Carole - if we fund to July 1 - we are saying to Winnipeg No. 1 that they should make up their minds on whether to keep going with it or not.
- perhaps Panel could put in Recommendation that there was some commitment made, that they have some concern, that some move be made to recognize these positions in budgeting commitments.
  - Carole - have the word "Indigenous" changed?
  - not appropriate
  - Ethnic Community Workers?

RECOMMENDATION: That M.E. fund the two ethnic workers for $47,600 for the calendar year 1987 and an evaluation be submitted October 15, 1987 for consideration of cost sharing on an ongoing basis. Panel expresses concern over the withdrawal of the Division's funding commitment originally given to include these positions in their budget by November/86. Panel questions the use of the word "indigenous" in this context.

CURRICULUM ADAPTATION - SUNI

a) Language Arts K-3

RECOMMENDATION: That this proposal be deferred. That the Division resubmit in April, 1987 a more carefully developed plan including:
- identification of schools, process, speakers;
- evaluation plan.

That M.E. staff be involved in the planning process.

b) Social Studies

RECOMMENDATION: That this proposal be deferred. That the Division resubmit in April, 1987 a more carefully developed plan including:
- evaluation plan;
- identified schools;
- other sources of funding.

That M.E. staff be involved in the planning process.

c) Folders & Writing Process

RECOMMENDATION: That M.E. not fund this proposal.

d) Secondary Language Arts - not recommended. There is funding through School Based Model for this kind of thing.
  - idea of School Based Planning Model - reflects improvement model for Manitoba at school level (R.B. Russell and Isaac Newton).

- Carole - should let Division know that there are questions re: how this fits into Compensatory funding.
  - provide support Division-wide?
  - sharing of information?
  - Divison's definition of Curriculum Adaptation?

RECOMMENDATION: That this proposal be deferred. That the Division resubmit in April, 1987 a more carefully developed plan including:
- detailed budget;
- identified schools.

MULTICULTURAL REALITY - SUNI

- Suni - wanted to redirect some of the monies from V.I.P. project to this one.
  - materials package for workshop participants be made available
  - we are talking about $17,000.00 slippage from V.I.P.
  - Panel requires statement of budget beforehand
- Sylvia - we could recommend to cover the material costs.
- Carole - need to know if we are tied to funding
  - need to know how much dollars we have

ISSUE: If Panel would approve transferral of V.I.P. funds to this project.

RECOMMENDATION: That M.E. fund Native Component $10,000 for spring/87 following receipt of the program plan to be submitted by December 31, 1986.

I LOVE TO READ DAY - SUE

- met with Reading Council
- province-wide in February
- have funding from various groups
- said we would consider it if there is a strong inner city component
- information given in proposal as to Winnipeg No. 1's involvement
- request $1,000
- emphasize to the group the inner city component and parent Council's involvement
- should contact volunteer coordinator
- Panel agreed to fund $1,000

RECOMMENDATION: That M.E. contribute $1,000 to the above project. That M.E. receive a final report upon completion which outlines the inner city involvement and a statement of expenditures.

7) EVALUATIONS

- Peer Counselling, Elementary Counselling and Multicultural - get an outside evaluator in.
- Division has hired one of the positions (term)
- are interviewing again in the next few weeks to fill second position.
- Division still has no Director of Research - is really in a bind - have not found suitable person yet.

RECOMMENDATION: $10-12,000 from shortfall in not filling positions to cover Multicultural Reality and Peer Counselling evaluations.

SUMMER WRITING PROGRAM - SUNI

- paying teachers in summer for developing units.
- accountability is a problem
- Pat - when Panel funds a summer project - need to know who's monitoring and what's being done.
- Carole - should be looking at fee-for-service upon delivery of document.
  - pay a certain amount and the rest upon completion of unit.

PARENT CONFERENCE - SUNI

- 3 important workshops that would have been relevant to inner city parents were cancelled.
- notices were sent via school children to parents.
- in future if we continue to fund, we should use various appproaches.
- Dorothy - Inner City Voice - mentioned their issue on education - the staff there is more than willing to publicize.
- Carole - have approached Marshall Murdoch to develop a native component for the next one.
  - parents were involved - but were from River Heights and Sacre Cours. Committee that structured the conference will have to decide whether a large conference is feasible. May need to focus on a smaller community i.e. Freight House.
- Pat - should concerns be outlined for the Division?
  - outline in writing (direct letter to committee re: parents' concerns).
- Suni - concerned that inner city didn't get official credit for funding.

8) NEXT MEETING

- middle of May/87 - potential dates are May 11, 12 (Monday or Tuesday).

DOLLARS AVAILABLE

MAY, 1987

COMPENSATORY SUPPORT PROGRAM

1987 Financial Overview

Grant Dollars Committed to 1987

Winnipeg #1	$863,879	
Non-Winnipeg #1	$288,140	
TOTAL		$1,152,019
Balance to be committed April/87.		$ 747,981

Pilot Dollars Committed 1987	$ 41,655
Balance Remaining	$ 158,345

DECEMBER 2, 1986

COMPENSATORY SUPPORT PROJECTS - SPRING 1986

NON-WINNIPEG SCHOOL DIVISION NO. 1

DIVISION/SCHOOL	TITLE	# PR-SD1	TYPE (YEAR)	AMOUNT RECOMMENDED	FUNDS HELD	FUNDS RELEASED	DATE RELEASED
BROOKLANDS	PRE-SCHOOL ENRICHMENT & READINESS PROGRAM	2-112	3	$55,000		$55,000	01/10/86
STEVENSON-BRITTANIA	ELEMENTARY SCHOOL COUNSELLOR	2-013	2	$20,000		$20,000	01/10/86
MARION/FRONTENAC	LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM	4-118	2	$12,000		$12,000	01/10/86
MARION	LEARNING ASSISTANCE PROGRAM	4-117	3	$45,000		$45,000	01/10/86
VICTOR WYATT	COMMUNITY LIAISON WORKER	6-303	1	$26,000		$26,000	01/10/86
VICTOR MAGER	COMMUNITY WORKER	6-180	2	$27,000		$27,000	01/10/86
ARCHWOOD	HOME-SCHOOL LIAISON	8-164	2	$23,000		$23,000	01/10/86
KING GEORGE V	HOME-SCHOOL LIAISON	8-137	2	$24,000		$24,000	01/10/86
HAMPSTEAD	COMMUNITY LIAISON/ MIGRANCY AIDE	9-095	1	$32,000		$32,000	01/10/86
DIVISION WIDE	SEXUAL ABUSE PROGRAM	10-065	1	$8,000		$8,000	01/10/86
ELWICK	ELEMENTARY GUIDANCE	10-307	1	$37,500		$37,500	01/10/86
MARYMOUND	TRANSITION TO A SECOND CHANCE	10-023	2	$13,800		$13,800	01/10/86
REGENT PARK	HOME-SCHOOL LIAISON/ PARAPROFESSIONAL	12-177	1	$35,000		$35,000	01/12/86
	TOTAL			$358,300		$358,300	

MAY 1, 1987

COMPENSATORY SUPPORT PROJECTS - APPROVED NOVEMBER 1986

NON-WINNIPEG NO. 1

DIV. SCHOOL	TITLE	# PR-SD-	TYPE (YEAR)	AMOUNT RECOMMENDED	FUNDS HELD	FUNDS RELEASED	S/F	DATE RELEASED
ST. JAMES/ASSINIBOIA	MIGRANCY	2-365	NEW	$20,000		$20,000	F	MAR.2/87
#6,8,9,12	EVALUATION: HOME-SCHOOL LIAISON	6-381	NEW	$15,000		$15,000	F	MAR.2/87
KING GEORGE V	FREE STAGE FOR YOUTH	8-379	NEW	$ 3,000		$3,000	F	MAR.2/87
NEIL CAMPBELL	ELEMENTARY GUIDANCE	9-364	NEW	$20,000	$20,000		F	CANCELLED
EDMUND PARTRIDGE	LEARNING CENTRE	10-308	NEW	$27,000		$27,000	F	MAR.2/87
				-------	-------	-------		
		TOTAL		$85,000	$20,000	$65,000		

APRIL 29, 1987

COMPENSATORY SUPPORT PROJECTS - 1987

PILOTS

DIV. SCHOOL	TITLE	# PR-SD-	TYPE (YEAR)	AMOUNT RECOMMENDED	FUNDS HELD	FUNDS RELEASED	DATE APPROVED	DATE RELEASED
ST. BONIFACE #4	MARION SCHOOL PRIDE	4-382	PILOT	$4,655		$4,655	16/01/87	10/02/87
RIVER EAST #9	TEACHER MENTOR	9-299	PILOT	$10,000	$10,000		17/11/86	
WINNIPEG #1	I LOVE TO READ DAY	377	PILOT	$1,000		$1,000	17/11/86	10/02/87
WINNIPEG #1	SPECIAL NEEDS PROGRAM PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT	335	PILOT	$6,000		$6,000	17/11/86	10/02/87
WINNIPEG #1	INNER CITY CONFERENCE	335	PILOT	$4,000		$4,000	17/11/86	
WINNIPEG #1	STRATHCONA P/C CENTRE		PILOT	$10,000		$10,000	10/04/87	22/04/87
WINNIPEG #1	INVISIBLE KIDS/SKIN	385	PILOT	$6,000		$6,000	30/03/87	29/04/87
				-------	-------	-------		
				$41,655	$10,000	$31,655		

DECEMBER 2, 1986

COMPENSATORY SUPPORT PROJECTS - 1986

PILOTS

DIVISION/SCHOOL	TITLE	# PR-SD1	TYPE (YEAR)	AMOUNT RECOMMENDED	FUNDS HELD	FUNDS RELEASED	DATE APPROVED	DATE RELEASED
ABERDEEN/ARGYLE/ R.B. RUSSELL	STUDENT AID SUPPORT	346	PILOT	$4,900		$4,900	15/05/86	01/10/86
BOOKMATES	PARENT WORKSHOPS	334	PILOT	$8,825		$8,825	15/05/86	14/07/86
TERRY FOX YOUTH CENTRE	SUMMER PROGRAM	291	PILOT	$1,800		$1,800	15/05/86	14/07/86
WINNIPEG NO. 1	MIGRANCY TEACHERS CONFERENCE	277	PILOT	$275		$275	03/03/86	14/07/86
R.B. RUSSELL	NON-TRADITIONAL EMPLOYMENT - FEMALES	337	PILOT	$10,000		$10,000	15/05/86	01/10/86
WINNIPEG NO. 1	PARENT TRAINER COURSE	298	PILOT	$2,600		$2,600	11/04/86	14/07/86
PARENT/CHILD CENTRE ADVISORY BOARD	ADMIN. SUMMER PROJECT SUPPORT	347	PILOT	$4,000		$4,000	17/05/86	14/07/86
MANITOBA EDUCATION	HOLISTIC EVALUATION WORKSHOP	278	PILOT	$4,000		$4,000	28/03/86	14/07/86
MANITOBA EDUCATION	INNER CITY UNIVERSITY	318	PILOT	$4,200		$4,200	06/06/86	14/07/86
WINNIPEG NO. 1	TEACHER SECONDMENT	358	PILOT	$47,000		$47,000	15/08/86	01/10/86
COMMUNITY	RESEARCH PROJECT: NEEDS OF NATIVE CHILDREN	357	PILOT	$5,000		$5,000	15/08/86	15/08/86
WINNIPEG NO. 1	PARENT INFORMATION CONFERENCE	263	PILOT	$3,000		$3,000	19/09/86	06/10/86
MANITOBA PUPPET THEATRE	PUPPET THEATRE TOUR OF INNER CITY SCHOOLS	362	PILOT	$1,000		$1,000	19/09/86	06/10/86
ACTORS' SHOWCASE	FALL TOUR OF 'PEACEMAKER'	363	PILOT	$4,000		$4,000	19/09/86	06/10/86
PARENT/CHILD CENTRES	EDMONTON INNER CITY CONFERENCE	361	PILOT	$1,500		$1,500	25/09/86	06/10/86
PARENT/CHILD CENTRE ADVISORY BOARD	ADMIN. SUPPORT PARENT/ CHILD RESOURCE CENTRES	347	PILOT	$3,500		$3,500	25/09/86	06/10/86
WINNIPEG NO. 1	MODEMS	372	PILOT	$10,000		$10,000	31/10/86	13/11/86
WINNIPEG NO. 1	INNER CITY	368	PILOT	$6,000		$6,000	31/10/86	13/11/86
ST. VITAL NO. 6	EVALUATION WORKSHOP	6-360	PILOT	$4,000		$4,000	19/09/86	06/10/86
SEVEN OAKS NO. 10	MARYMOUND: PROJECT LIFE BOOK	10-374	PILOT	$9,950		$9,950	17/11/86	05/12/86
	TOTAL			$135,550		$135,550		

PROJECTS REQUESTING 2nd YEAR FUNDING

PROJECTS REQUESTING 2nd YEAR FUNDING

PROJECT	DIVISION/SCHOOL	FUNDED 86/87	REQUEST 87/88	RECOMMEND	PAGE #
Community-Liaison	Victor Wyatt St. Vital #6	$ 26,000	$ 30,000	$ 28,500	3-2
Community-Liaison	Hampstead River East #9	$ 32,000	$ 32,000	$ 35,000	3-6
Guidance	Elwick/O.V. Jewitt Seven Oaks #10	$ 37,500	$ 37,500	$ 37,500	3-10
Community-Liaison	Regent Park Transcona #12	$ 35,000	$ 35,000	$ 27,500	3-14
Learning Assistance	Edmund Partridge Seven Oaks #10	$ 16,200	$ 27,000	$ 27,000	3-18

ST. VITAL SCHOOL DIVISION NO. 6

VICTOR H.L. WYATT SCHOOL

COMMUNITY LIAISON WORKER

PR-SD6-303

SUMMARY SHEETS FOR PROJECT SUBMISSIONS

REGION: Urban Non-Winnipeg
M.E. STAFF PERSON: Jack King
SCHOOL DIVISION: St. Vital S.D. #6
SCHOOL: Victor H.L. Wyatt

COMMUNITY-SCHOOL LIAISON

DESCRIPTION OF NEED

General Census Tract data (1981) previously established. The community lacks recreational opportunities for the (K-8) students that the school serves because of inaccessible community clubs.

PROGRAM OBJECTIVE

To facilitate the school's provision of leadership and services to better meet community needs.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

1. To identify community educational, recreational and social needs not being met by existing school, agency or social service programs.
2. To provide opportunities to the community for participation in the development and evaluation of programs to meet identified needs.
3. To develop an evaluation mechanism for measuring program and communication effectiveness.
4. To establish effective communication links between community, school and service agencies.
5. To seek auxiliary financial support for program development.
6. To identify talented volunteers and part-time experts to plan and implement programs.
7. To provide an environment conducive to the development of evening, weekend and summer programs through the support of school personnel and increased access to the school facility.

The Compensatory Grant provides for one full-time Community Liaison Worker.

RENEWALS
PROJECTS REQUESTING 2ND YEAR FUNDING

RESULTS TO DATE

All objectives are operationalized. Extensive use of volunteers in programs and many opportunities for involvement of students, staff, parents, agencies and the community at large. Effective leadership and support at the school and Division levels.

YEAR II EVALUATION PLANS

To participate in the External Evaluation of the Community-School Program. To implement the Year II plan as provided utilizing observation, anecdotal, and survey techniques. A log of activities and participation will be maintained.

ACTUAL COST 1986/87

ME Contribution		**Division Contribution**	
Materials:	$1,000.00	**Materials:**	non-consumable
Personnel:	$25,000.00	**Personnel:**	custodial support

REQUESTED BUDGET 1987/88

ME Contribution		**Division Contribution**	
Materials:		**Materials:**	
Personnel:	$30,000.00	**Personnel:**	custodial support

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS: $30,000.00

COMMENTS/CONTINGENCIES

The funded position is filled by an outstanding person who provides leadership and vision to the program. A Parent Council has been recently formed. The Division has planned a comprehensive plan in Community Liaison activity projected to 1991.

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS

That M.E. fund $28,500.00 ($27,500.00 salary based on $2,500.00 for 11 months and $500.00 materials and $500.00 professional development) and that the final evaluation be submitted by April 15, 1988.

Manitoba

Education Inner City Initiatives

124 King Street
Winnipeg, Manitoba, CANADA
R3B 1H9

DATE: May 20, 1986

REGION: Urban

SCHOOL DIVISION: St. Vital S.D. #6

SCHOOL: Victor H.L. Wyatt

RENEWAL:

NEW: X

PILOT:

REQUEST: $30,000

PROJECT: Community Liaison Worker

FILE NO: PR-SD6-303

ADJUDICATION PANEL COMMENTS/CONTINGENCIES/RECOMMENDATIONS:

That M.E. fund to a maximum of $26,000 for the community worker($25,000) and materials ($1,000) contingent upon the Division submitting an evaluation plan for Year 1 by June 30, 1986. That to facilitate the adequacy of the design of the evaluation, the project staff be asked to attend an evaluation workshop presented by M.E. this Fall/86. That interim evaluation is due April 15, 1987 and final formal evaluation to be submitted April 15, 1988.

HOLD FUNDS

RECOMMENDATION: $26,000

RIVER EAST SCHOOL DIVISION NO. 9

HAMPSTEAD SCHOOL

COMMUNITY LIAISON WORKER

PR-SD9-95

SUMMARY SHEETS FOR PROJECT SUBMISSIONS

REGION: Urban Non-Winnipeg
M.E. STAFF PERSON: Jack King
SCHOOL DIVISION: River East S.D. #9
SCHOOL: Hampstead

COMMUNITY LIAISON - MARGINAL STUDENT PROGRAM

DESCRIPTION OF NEED

60% Multiple Dwellings. Migrancy - 71%. Other Census Tract data from 1981 established need.

PROGRAM OBJECTIVE

To support marginal students by developing programs and services to help ensure their success in the elementary school.
To encourage parents to be more involved with their school.
To make the school more inviting to promote parental involvement in the formal education of their child.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Personnel M.E. funded: one instructional aide (Grade 4 team) and one Community Liaison Worker.
Aide supports Grade 4 team addressing language developments among marginal students.
Community Liaison Worker works collaboratively with the Parent Council in developing programs for parents, organizing volunteers and assisting in community empowerment activities.

RENEWALS
PROJECTS REQUESTING 2ND YEAR FUNDING

RESULTS TO DATE

Established Parent Council, conducted needs assessment. Planned and implemented 16 courses offered during day and evening and weekends for parents. Developed an effective link with other community services agencies. Programs are well attended and popular.

YEAR II EVALUATION PLANS

To follow.

ACTUAL COST 1986/87

ME Contribution		**Division Contribution**	
Materials:		**Materials:**	$9,500.00
Personnel:	$32,000.00	**Personnel:**	$41,000.00

REQUESTED BUDGET 1987/88

ME Contribution		**Division Contribution**	
Materials:		**Materials:**	$12,000.00 ($2,000.00 staff development)
Personnel:	$32,000.00	**Personnel:**	$10,000.00

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS: $54,000.00

COMMENTS/CONTINGENCIES

The teacher's aide position is a priority for the Division.

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS

That M.E. fund $35,000 ($25,000 Community Liaison Worker - (based on $2,500/mth. for 10 months) and $10,000 teacher's aide contingent upon the Division continuing to match the aide position without asking for Special Needs funding. That the final evaluation be submitted by April 15, 1988.

Manitoba

Education Inner City Initiatives

124 King Street
Winnipeg, Manitoba, CANADA
R3B 1H9

DATE: May 20, 1986

REGION: Urban

SCHOOL DIVISION: River East S.D. #9

SCHOOL: Hampstead

RENEWAL:

NEW: X

PILOT:

REQUEST: $55,000

PROJECT: Community Liaison Worker and Migrancy Aide

FILE NO: PR-SD9-95

ADJUDICATION PANEL COMMENTS/CONTINGENCIES/RECOMMENDATIONS:

That M.E. fund to a maximum of $32,000 for: 1) the migrancy aide contingent upon Division matching this position with an aide not paid through special needs grants; 2) the community liaison worker on a 10-month term ($21,000 based on $25,000 salary) and $1,000 for expenses. All funds contingent upon Division submitting: a) confirmation of matched funding; b) evaluation plan for Year 1 by June 30, 1986. That to facilitate the design of the evaluation the project staff be asked to attend an evaluation workshop presented by M.E. in the Fall/86. Interim evaluation to be submitted April 15, 1987 and final evaluation April 15, 1988. That linkages occur with other community liaison programs and parent/child centres.

HOLD FUNDS

RECOMMENDATION: $32,000

SEVEN OAKS SCHOOL DIVISION NO. 10

ELWICK AND O.V. JEWITT SCHOOLS

ELEMENTARY GUIDANCE PROGRAM

PR-SD10-307

SUMMARY SHEETS FOR PROJECT SUBMISSIONS

REGION:	Urban Non-Winnipeg
M.E. STAFF PERSON:	Jack King
SCHOOL DIVISION:	Seven Oaks S.D. #10
SCHOOL:	O.V. Jewitt/Elwick

ELEMENTARY GUIDANCE

DESCRIPTION OF NEED

Previously established through 1981 Census Tract data.

- Elwick (K-6) 482 students; during September-March - 300 in person contacts and 335 teachers.
- O.V. Jewitt (K-6) 575 students; during September-March - 290 in person contacts and 320 teachers.

PROGRAM OBJECTIVE

To establish and maintain services and programs that assist students with their social and emotional development.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Two half-time Elementary Guidance positions are funded by M.E. with another two half-time positions matched by the Division. A coordinator, Marilyn Froment, provides divisional leadership and facilitates reporting and staff development plans. The Counselling Program includes a focus on the child - individual, small group and classroom. Where possible, the counsellors provide teachers with support. All programs recognize involvement in crisis counselling as essential but that the overall focus is on preventative counselling.

RENEWALS
PROJECTS REQUESTING 2ND YEAR FUNDING

RESULTS TO DATE

- Efficient role definition and introduction into the school/community.
- Effective system of referrals of students by students, teachers, administration, parents and/or agencies.
- Time management for 3 modes of counselling: individual, small group, whole class.

YEAR II EVALUATION PLANS

Coordination by Marilyn Froment of: counsellors logs; surveys of attitude parents, students, agencies, and teachers; combination of observation and interview techniques.

ACTUAL COST 1986/87

ME Contribution		Division Contribution	
Materials:	-	**Materials:**	-
Personnel:	$37,500.00	**Personnel:**	$37,500.00

REQUESTED BUDGET 1987/88

ME Contribution		Division Contribution	
Materials:	-	**Materials:**	-
Personnel:	$37,500.00	**Personnel:**	$37,500.00

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS: $75,000.00

COMMENTS/CONTINGENCIES

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS

M.E. staff recommends funding of $37,500.00 to provide two .5 Elementary Guidance positions contingent upon the Divisions providing matching funds to maintain another two .5 positions and that the final evaluation be submitted by April 15, 1988.

Manitoba

Education Inner City Initiatives

124 King Street
Winnipeg, Manitoba, CANADA
R3B 1H9

DATE: May 20, 1986

REGION: Urban

SCHOOL DIVISION: Seven Oaks S.D.#10

SCHOOL: Elwick Elementary School

RENEWAL:

NEW: X

PILOT:

REQUEST: $37,500

PROJECT: Elementary Guidance Counsellor

FILE NO: PR-SD10-307

ADJUDICATION PANEL COMMENTS/CONTINGENCIES/RECOMMENDATIONS:

That M.E. fund to a maximum of $37,500 for one elementary counselling position contingnet upon the Division: 1) matching this position at a second school; 2) confirming the qualifications of the counsellor; 3) submitting an evaluation plan for Year 1 by June 30, 1986 to include an impact study. That to facilitate the adequacy of the design of the evaluation, the project staff be asked to attend an evaluation workshop presented by M.E. in the Fall/86. That counsellor liaise with other Divisions who have peer counsellors and suggest participation at a 1/2 day workshop to be planned for peer counselling. Interim evaluation to be submitted April 15, 1987 and formal final evaluation due April 15, 1988.

RECOMMENDATION: $37,500

HOLD FUNDS

TRANSCONA-SPRINGFIELD SCHOOL DIVISION NO. 12

REGENT PARK SCHOOL

COMMUNITY LIAISON WORKER

PR-SD12-177

SUMMARY SHEETS FOR PROJECT SUBMISSIONS

REGION: Urban Non-Winnipeg
M.E. STAFF PERSON: JacK King
SCHOOL DIVISION: Transcona-Springfield #12
SCHOOL: Regent Park

COMMUNITY-SCHOOL LIAISON

DESCRIPTION OF NEED

1981 Census Tract established need previously.
Single parent families - 12%;)
Migrancy - 15%.) 1985-86 statistics

PROGRAM OBJECTIVE

To provide Community-School Liaison that will encourage parent involvement and support. To provide individual and small group support to 46 identified students.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Paraprofessional assists the Community Liaison Worker by monitoring the "Call Back" program and operating the Parent Child Drop-In. She also coordinates a Clothing Depot.
The Community Liaison Worker and Paraprofessional are funded through the Compensatory Grant.

A Parent Resource Centre has been established this year and is used for program presentations and meeting space. Toys are available for pre-school-age children as part of a Parent Child Drop-In. A Clothing Depot is established. There is a balance between informal contact through drop-in and formal program development offered during the day.

RENEWALS
PROJECTS REQUESTING 2ND YEAR FUNDING

RESULTS TO DATE

Steering Committee in place with stronger ties to a Parent Committee. Funds provided by NEW FACESS used to establish a Drop-In Centre for parents and children. Programs developed anticipate community needs. Links are made to business for funding support and donations.

YEAR II EVALUATION PLANS

Not finalized.

ACTUAL COST 1986/87
ME Contribution

Materials:
Personnel: $35,000.00

Division Contribution

Materials:
Personnel: $10,000.00

REQUESTED BUDGET 1987/88
ME Contribution

Materials:
Personnel: $35,000.00

Division Contribution

Materials:
Personnel:

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS: $35,000.00

COMMENTS/CONTINGENCIES

More creative planning and utilization of the Community Liaison Worker is needed - flexible working hours and more out-of-school activity. There are currently seven full-time paraprofessionals (including M.E. funded paraprofessionals) and two part-time paraprofessionals.

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS

That M.E. continue to fund a Community Liaison Worker position ($27,500 based on $2,500/mth. for 11 months) and that no further funds be provided for a paraprofessional. Final evaluation to be submitted by April 15, 1988. Funding is contingent upon submission by June 30, 1987 of: 1) an evaluation plan; 2) a work plan which indicates ways to operationalize the objectives in the following areas: a) more emphasis on home visits by Community Liaison Worker; b) establishment of evening programs for students and adults; c) development of stronger needs assessment data from the community.

Manitoba

Education

Inner City Initiatives

124 King Street
Winnipeg, Manitoba, CANADA
R3B 1H9

DATE: May 20, 1986

REGION: Urban

SCHOOL DIVISION: Transcona-Springfield S.D.#12

SCHOOL: Regent Park

RENEWAL:

NEW: X

PILOT:

REQUEST: $35,000.00

PROJECT: Home-School Liaison and Paraprofessional

FILE NO: PR-SD12-177

ADJUDICATION PANEL COMMENTS/CONTINGENCIES/RECOMMENDATIONS:

That M.E. fund to a maximum of $35,000 for one paraprofessional ($10,000) and a home-school liaison worker ($25,000) and that these positions work together closely with school and community. Funding contingent upon Division: a) continuing to match the aide position with funds not earmarked for special needs; b) submitting confirmation that the responsibilities of the aide funded by M.E. are community and social interaction based; c) submit Year I evaluation plan by June 30/86 following discussion with M.E. staff. That interim evaluation report be submitted April 15/87 and final evaluation April 15/88. That to facilitate the adequacy of the design of the evaluation, the project staff be asked to participate in an evaluation workshop presented by M.E. staff in Fall/86 and liaise with other community programs.

RECOMMENDATION: $35,000.00

HOLD FUNDS

SEVEN OAKS SCHOOL DIVISION NO. 10

EDMUND PARTRIDGE SCHOOL

LEARNING ASSISTANCE CENTRE

PR-SD10-308

SUMMARY SHEETS FOR PROJECT SUBMISSIONS

REGION: Urban-Non-Winnipeg
M.E. STAFF PERSON: Jack King
SCHOOL DIVISION: Seven Oaks S.D.#10
SCHOOL: Edmund Partridge

LEARNING ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

DESCRIPTION OF NEED

Census Tract Data - 1981 - previously established.
Student population 325 (Junior High): 15% single-parent families, 17% functioning 2 years below placement, 25% repeated one or more grades, 6% CGC involvement.

PROGRAM OBJECTIVE

To provide support to students individually and in small groups to better insure academic success.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

A team headed by the Resource Teacher, cooperating teachers, a teachers' aide and regular classroom teachers develop programs for students following assessment. Cooperating teachers work in the classroom with identified students. Meeting time is provided for conferencing on students and for sharing successful strategies and interventions.

RENEWALS
PROJECTS REQUESTING 2ND YEAR FUNDING

RESULTS TO DATE

One half-time cooperating teacher position, funded by M.E., has been filled. Learning Assistance Program staff operate as a team and meet on a regular basis. Staff development and training strategies are developed and being implemented. Forty students participate in the program and have improved their academic performance.

YEAR II EVALUATION PLANS

1. Pre-/post-testing - curriculum based as well as standardized testing;
2. Attendance records;
3. Classroom Observation - attending skills, participation;
4. Verbal/Written Feedback - survey parents, teachers, students and other professionals (e.g. Child Guidance Clinic).

ACTUAL COST 1986/87

ME Contribution		**Division Contribution**	
Materials:		**Materials:**	all materials
Personnel:	$16,200.00	**Personnel:**	$24,000.00 .5 Teacher's Aide .5 Cooperating Teacher

REQUESTED BUDGET 1987/88

ME Contribution		**Division Contribution**	
Materials:		**Materials:**	
Personnel:	$27,000.00	**Personnel:**	$24,000.00 .5 Teacher's Aide .5 Cooperating Teacher

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS: $51,000.00

COMMENTS/CONTINGENCIES

Program appealed allocation of funds. By consensus of Panel, program staff was hired as teaching personnel, not as teachers' aides. Our funding now ends December 31, 1987.

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS

That M.E. fund an additional $16,200.00 to June 1988 for the .67 cooperating teacher. A final evaluation report to be submitted April 15, 1988.

Manitoba

Education

Regional Services

116 — 1200 Portage Avenue
Winnipeg, Manitoba, CANADA
R3G 0T5

DATE: November 18, 1986

REGION: Urban

SCHOOL DIVISION: Seven Oaks S.D.#10

SCHOOL: Edmund Partridge

RENEWAL:

NEW: X

PILOT:

REQUEST: $58,000

PROJECT TITLE: Learning Centres

FILE NO: PR-SD10-308

ADJUDICATION PANEL COMMENTS/CONTINGENCIES/RECOMMENDATIONS:

The Panel supports the concept of re-integration as it applies to this proposal and therefore recommends that M.E. fund 2 teacher aide positions not to exceed $26,000 and $1,000 for materials. An interim report must be submitted by April 15, 1987 and a final evaluation April 15, 1988. Prior to the release of funds, the division must provide an overview of the delivery service model to be used and job descriptions of the funded positions. It is suggested that emphasis be placed on mainstreaming activities.

HOLD FUNDS

RECOMMENDATION: $27,000

PROJECTS REQUESTING 4th YEAR FUNDING

PROJECTS REQUESTING 4th YEAR FUNDING

PROJECT	DIVISION/SCHOOL	FUNDED 86/87	REQUEST 87/88	RECOMMEND	PAGE #
Pre-School Enrichment	Brooklands St. James #2	$ 55,000	$ 63,500	$ 55,000	4-2
Learning Assistance	Marion St. Boniface #4	$ 45,000	$ 54,420	$ 45,000	4-6
Language Dev.	Marion/Frontenac St. Boniface #4	$ 12,000	$ 23,000	$ 12,000	4-10

ST. JAMES-ASSINIBOIA SCHOOL DIVISION NO. 2

BROOKLANDS SCHOOL

PRE-SCHOOL ENRICHMENT & READINESS PROGRAM

PR-SD2-112

SUMMARY SHEETS FOR PROJECT SUBMISSIONS

REGION: Urban Non-Winnipeg
M.E. STAFF PERSON: Jack King
SCHOOL DIVISION: St. James S.D. #2
SCHOOL: Brooklands

Pre-School Enrichment and Readiness

DESCRIPTION OF NEED

Ethnicity - Filipino 13.0%, Native 9.0%.
Single Parent - Nursery 12%, Kindergarten 4%, Grade 1 - 13%.
Mobility - Nursery - transfers - in 16% - out 24%; Kindergarten 22.7% and 18.8%.
*other data from 1981 Census Data Tract as established previously.

PROGRAM OBJECTIVE

To provide an environment where pre-school children can be exposed to a variety of academic, social and physical experiences.
To provide additional reinforcement and support in basic skill areas for specific kindergarten children.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

This program provides nursery and targeted kindergarten children with opportunities to develop academic and general readiness skills. Emphasis has been placed on developing language and social skills. Parental involvement is encouraged formally around school events such as parent evenings and workshops and informally through an attitude of acceptance and openness to "significant others." Parent volunteers are actively recruited in the nursery program.

A full-time nursery and .5 kindergarten teachers are funded through Compensatory Grants. The Division provides a full-time teacher's aide for the program at a cost of $10,000.00.

RENEWALS
PROJECTS REQUESTING 4TH YEAR FUNDING

RESPONSE TO EVALUATION RECOMMENDATIONS

- observational techniques, anecdotal reports and analysis of daily work show growth;
- the number of planned activities involving parents increased significantly;
- parent surveys indicate strong support for the programs;
- good variety of activities using language experience approaches in small groups and individual settings;
- cooperative teaching and planning.

ACTUAL COST 86/87

ME Contribution		**Division Contribution**	
Materials:		**Materials:**	
Personnel:	$55,000.00	**Personnel:**	

REQUESTED BUDGET 87/88

ME Contribution		**Division Contribution**	
Materials:	$500.00 (P.D.)	**Materials:**	
Personnel:	$63,000.00	**Personnel:**	

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS: $63,500.00

COMMENTS/CONTINGENCIES

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS

That M.E. fund $55,000.00 per year for two years with an evaluation report to be submitted by April 15, 1989 and an interim report by April 15, 1988. Such funding to be contingent upon: 1) the Division funding one teacher's aide position and that such a position be used in the funded program; 2) continuing effort be made to involve parents in school activities.

Manitoba

Education
Inner City Initiatives

124 King Street
Winnipeg, Manitoba, CANADA
R3B 1H9

DATE: May 20, 1986

REGION: Urban

SCHOOL DIVISION: St. James-Assiniboia S.D.#2

SCHOOL: Brooklands

RENEWAL: Year 3

NEW:

PILOT:

REQUEST: $57,037

PROJECT: Brooklands Pre-School Enrichment and Readiness Program

FILE NO:PR-SD2-112

ADJUDICATION PANEL COMMENTS/CONTINGENCIES/RECOMMENDATIONS:

That M.E. fund $55,000 for the 86/87 school year contingent upon: 1) formal evaluation plan submitted by June 30, 1986 that addresses parent involvement, Grade 1 statistics and social development components; 2) M.E. staff conveying concerns of Adjudication Panel members. That to facilitate the adequacy of the design of the evaluation, the project staff be asked to participate in an evaluation workshop presented by M.E. in the Fall/86.

HOLD FUNDS

RECOMMENDATION: $55,000

ST. BONIFACE SCHOOL DIVISION NO. 4

MARION SCHOOL

LEARNING ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

PR-SD4-117

SUMMARY SHEETS FOR PROJECT SUBMISSIONS

REGION: Urban-Non-Winnipeg
M.E. STAFF PERSON: Jack King
SCHOOL DIVISION: St. Boniface S.D.#4
SCHOOL: Marion

Learning Assistance Centre

DESCRIPTION OF NEED

Census Tract Data for 1981 established need previously, 30% single parents with 32% receiving social allowances, Migrancy 35%.

PROGRAM OBJECTIVE

To provide differential programming to identified students in a modified classroom setting.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Students are withdrawn from classroom on an average of 5 out of 6 classes to receive instruction in modified Language Arts and/or Mathematics. On-going communication between the classroom teacher and the L.A.P. teacher is stressed. Parents are given opportunities to assist their children by providing home support. The ultimate goal of the program is to integrate the students into regular classroom settings by providing reassurance, encouragement and support during the transition.

RENEWALS
PROJECTS REQUESTING 4TH YEAR FUNDING

RESPONSE TO EVALUATION RECOMMENDATIONS

- Nineteen students from Grades 4-8 participated (15 Language Arts, 14 Mathematics with 10 in L.A. and Math).
- Academic gains are apparent evidenced by pre/post testing.
- Evaluation recommends more stress at the classroom level by individualizing program needs, using cooperative teaching techniques.

ACTUAL COST 86/87

ME Contribution		**Division Contribution**	
Materials:		**Materials:**	
Personnel:	$45,000.00	**Personnel:**	full-time aide

REQUESTED BUDGET 87/88

ME Contribution		**Division Contribution**	
Materials:	$1,000.00	**Materials:**	
Personnel:	$53,420.00	**Personnel:**	

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS: $54,420.00

COMMENTS/CONTINGENCIES

The Division funds several prevention programs at Marion School recognizing needs of students. The Learning Assistance Centre emphasizes treatment because of the age of the students. Continued interaction in regular class settings is encouraged.

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS

That funding be maintained at $45,000 for two years contingent upon the Division continuing to commit one full-time teachers' aide to the Centre. An interim report will be submitted by April 15, 1988 and an evaluation report by April 15, 1989.

Manitoba

Education

Inner City Initiatives

124 King Street
Winnipeg, Manitoba, CANADA
R3B 1H9

DATE: May 20, 1986

REGION: Urban

SCHOOL DIVISION: St. Boniface S.D.#4

SCHOOL: Marion School

RENEWAL: 3rd Year

NEW:

PILOT:

REQUEST: $45,504.00

PROJECT: Learning Assistance Program

FILE NO: PR-SD4-117

ADJUDICATION PANEL COMMENTS/CONTINGENCIES/RECOMMENDATIONS:

That M.E. fund $45,000 for the school year 86/87 only with a final report submitted April 15/87. That Division be alerted to panel's concern regarding withdrawal programs and suggest more preventative programs such as adaptation and modification to the classrooms be examined.

RECOMMENDATION: $45,000

ST. BONIFACE SCHOOL DIVISION NO. 4
MARION AND FRONTENAC SCHOOLS
LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM
PR-SD4-118

SUMMARY SHEETS FOR PROJECT SUBMISSIONS

REGION: Urban-Non-Winnipeg
M.E. STAFF PERSON: Jack King
SCHOOL DIVISION: St. Boniface S.D.#4
SCHOOL: Marion/Frontenac

Language Development

DESCRIPTION OF NEED

1981 Census Data previously established community need. 26 students are identified as having significant language delay problems.

PROGRAM OBJECTIVE

To provide needed support for students experiencing a delay in their language development.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Students are grouped according to degree of need and receive individual or small group instruction. The teachers' aides are trained to assist with programs developed by the classroom teachers and/or language therapist. Parents are encouraged to participate in the program through observation and attendance at orientation meetings where home tutoring strategies were discussed. Communication is encouraged between home and school.

M.E. funds a teachers' aide position at Marion School matched by a Division sponsored position at Frontenac School who work under the direction of teaching staff with K-2 students.

RENEWALS
PROJECTS REQUESTING 4TH YEAR FUNDING

RESPONSE TO EVALUATION RECOMMENDATIONS

Significant growth is reported for students participating in the program using the Bankson Language Screening Test comparing October 1986 to April 1987 and the Bochon Test of Basic Concepts used for Grade 2 students. Efforts were made to establish Home Programs for parents on a voluntary basis. Thirteen of 26 parents with students in the program are using the home program. Observation reports are positive, indicating improvement generally in overall language, interaction of students with peers and group participation.

ACTUAL COST 86/87

ME Contribution		**Division Contribution**	
Materials:	$1,000.00	**Materials:**	$1,000.00
Personnel:	$11,000.00	**Personnel:**	$11,000.00

REQUESTED BUDGET 87/88

ME Contribution		**Division Contribution**	
Materials:	$2,000.00	**Materials:**	
Personnel:	$21,000.00	**Personnel:**	

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS: $23,000.00

COMMENTS/CONTINGENCIES

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS

That M.E. continue funding the program for two years at $12,000 per year with matched funding from the Division ($11,000 - staff; $1,000 - materials). That a progress report be submitted by April 15, 1988 and an evaluation report be submitted by April 15, 1989.

Manitoba

Education

Inner City Initiatives

124 King Street
Winnipeg, Manitoba, CANADA
R3B 1H9

DATE: May 20, 1986

REGION: Urban

SCHOOL DIVISION: St. Boniface S.D. #4

SCHOOL: Marion/Frontenac

RENEWAL: X

NEW:

PILOT:

REQUEST: $11,492

PROJECT: Language Development Program

FILE NO: PR-SD4-118

ADJUDICATION PANEL COMMENTS/CONTINGENCIES/RECOMMENDATIONS:

That M.E. continue to fund one site only to a maximum of $12,000 for personnel ($11,000) and materials ($1,000) contingent upon Division submitting: a) written confirmation to match funds in second site; b) formal evaluation plan for Year 2 by June 30/86 which addresses variance in gains between the two sites and success of attempts to involve parents; c) a plan to involve parents more closely in the program e.g. evening sessions. That to facilitate the adequacy of the design of the evaluation, the project staff be asked to attend an evaluation workshop presented by M.E. in the Fall/86. Final evaluation to be submitted by April 15, 1987.

HOLD FUNDS

RECOMMENDATION: $12,000

PROJECTS REQUESTING 3rd YEAR FUNDING

PROJECTS REQUESTING 3rd YEAR FUNDING

PROJECT	DIVISION/SCHOOL	FUNDED 86/87	REQUEST 87/88	RECOMMEND	PAGE #
Guidance	Stevenson-Brit. St. James #2	$ 20,000	$ 45,030	$ 20,000	5-2
Community-Liaison	Victor Mager St. Vital #6	$ 27,000	$ 15,000	$ 13,750	5-6
Community-Liaison	Archwood Norwood #8	$ 23,000	$ 27,230	$ 12,500	5-15
Community-Liaison	King George V Norwood #8	$ 24,000	$ 27,230	$ 17,500	5-19
Transition	Marymound	$ 13,800	$ 14,100	$ 14,100	5-23

ST. JAMES-ASSINIBOIA SCHOOL DIVISION NO. 2

STEVENSON-BRITTANIA SCHOOL

ELEMENTARY COUNSELLING PROGRAM

PR-SD2-013

SUMMARY SHEETS FOR PROJECT SUBMISSIONS

REGION: Urban-Non-Winnipeg
M.E. STAFF PERSON: Jack King
SCHOOL DIVISION: St. James S.D.#2
SCHOOL: Stevenson-Brittania

Elementary Guidance

DESCRIPTION OF NEED

-General need based on 1981 Census Data Tract established previously
-Mobility 28%
-Counselling referrals to March, 1987 - 89
-Ethnicity - Native 8% ESL 18.7%
-Single-parent households - 25%

PROGRAM OBJECTIVE

To provide a counselling service for students and implement an outreach service to parents.
To assist staff in coordinating services and programs.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

1. To provide counselling on an individual, small group and classroom basis
2. To provide crisis-based intervention service
3. To coordinate and implement outreach to parents
4. To collaborate with staff, support services and Child and Family Services
5. To develop programs encouraging more positive student-student relationships
6. To assist staff in using group interaction principals and counselling techniques
7. To serve as a resource to staff in the use of materials and class guidance counselling activities
8. To provide orientation for students and parents new to the school.

The services of .5 Guidance Counsellor is provided through the Compensatory Grant.

RESUBMISSION
PROJECTS REQUESTING 3RD YEAR FUNDING

PROGRAM EVALUATION SUMMARY
(All funding requests for projects ending Year II should include a copy of the completed evaluation.)

- Four new objectives are recommended and relate to a community outreach focus;
- 49 whole class sessions;
- 39 students counselled (referred by teachers - 31; parents - 5; self - 2; other - 1);
- Parental contacts (notes/letters - 2; homes visited - 8; meetings at school - 36; phone calls - 19 school-initiated, 19 home-initiated);
- Counsellor time - 60% crisis intervention, 40% developmental preventative;
- Evaluation suggests support from teachers generally. No evaluation survey of parent or agency satisfaction with the program.

ACTUAL COST 86/87

ME Contribution **Materials:**	-	**Division Contribution** **Materials:**	-
Personnel:	$20,000	**Personnel:**	-

REQUESTED BUDGET 87/88

ME Contribution **Materials:**	($4,230 - P.D.) $5,030 ($800 - materials)	**Division Contribution** **Materials:**	
Personnel:	$40,000	**Personnel:**	

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS: $45,030

COMMENTS/CONTINGENCIES

Program funded in Fall, 1985 began in December, 1985. Panel funded Jameswood with the understanding that Jameswood was a priority over Stevenson, and Stevenson's funding would not be continued. Divisional priority is to maintain current level of funding.

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS

That M.E. maintain funding level ($20,000) due to Division's priorities. That a report be submitted April, 1988 indicating community outreach activities and surveys of community.

Manitoba

Education

Inner City Initiatives

124 King Street
Winnipeg, Manitoba, CANADA
R3B 1H9

DATE: May 20, 1986

REGION: Urban

SCHOOL DIVISION: St. James-Assiniboia S.D.#2

SCHOOL: Stevenson-Britannia

RENEWAL: X

NEW:

PILOT:

REQUEST: $22,260.00

PROJECT: Elementary School Counsellor

FILE NO: PR-SD2-013

ADJUDICATION PANEL COMMENTS/CONTINGENCIES/RECOMMENDATIONS:

That M.E. continue to fund .5 counsellor to a maximum of $20,000 contingent upon Division submitting: a) statement of salary costs for 85-86 school year and any remaining dollars to be deducted from the approved amount for 1986/87; b) formal evaluation plan for Year 2 submitted by June 30, 1986; c) written confirmation that a volunteer or aide representative of one of the predominant ethnic groups in the school community has been deployed to assist in the program. That final evaluation will be submitted by April 15/87 and that to facilitate the adequacy of the design of the evaluation, the project staff be asked to participate in an evaluation workshop presented by M.E. this Fall/86. That evaluation carefully address success of outreach activities. That counsellor and aide liaise with Winnipeg No. 1 CEDA staff and other community liaison workers in terms of community involvement and outreach.

HOLD FUNDS

RECOMMENDATION: $20,000.00

ST. VITAL SCHOOL DIVISION NO. 6

VICTOR MAGER SCHOOL

COMMUNITY LIAISON WORKER

PR-SD6-180

SUMMARY SHEETS FOR PROJECT SUBMISSIONS

REGION: Urban-Non-Winnipeg
M.E. STAFF PERSON: Jack King
SCHOOL DIVISION: St. Vital S.D.#6
SCHOOL: Victor Mager

Community-School Liaison

DESCRIPTION OF NEED

Previously established.

PROGRAM OBJECTIVE

To assist in the development of a Community School concept by providing a Community Liaison Worker who will assist the school and provide leadership in the community.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

1. To identify, develop and provide educational, leisure and social services with primary attention given to students of the school and their parents.
2. To provide opportunity for community participation in planning and evaluating services and programs.
3. To cooperate with other community and government agencies and schools in coordinating services to the community.
4. To provide educational opportunities for post-secondary students.
5. To maintain links with other agencies through participation and assistance in project related research.
6. To adopt research findings enhancing the development of the program.
7. To create an environment conducive to the successful implementation of the program.

The Compensatory Grant provides for the services of one full-time Community Liaison Worker.

RESUBMISSION
PROJECTS REQUESTING 3RD YEAR FUNDING

PROGRAM EVALUATION SUMMARY
(All funding requests for projects ending Year II should include a copy of the completed evaluation.)

- Extensive surveys and log records are provided;
- 46 Parent Volunteers participated in programs;
- Evening programs were offered to (K-6) students and parents and are positively evaluated;
- Referrals were made for 35 children to attend summer camps;
- Adult referrals made to CNIB, City Social Services, Women's Shelter Klinic, Employment Counselling and Supportive Counselling to Women;
- Special Events (Winter Carnival, Hot Dog Days, Community Garage Sale) were well received and attended.

ACTUAL COST 86/87

ME Contribution		**Division Contribution**	
Materials:	$1,000.00	**Materials:**	
Personnel:	$25,000.00	**Personnel:**	

REQUESTED BUDGET 87/88

ME Contribution		**Division Contribution**	
Materials:		**Materials:**	non-consumables
Personnel:	$15,000.00	**Personnel:**	$10,000.00 coordinator of volunteers

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS: $15,500.00 ($500.00 for Professional Development activity)

COMMENTS/CONTINGENCIES

St. Vital S.D. #6 has developed a long-range program, Community Liaison Funding Model, establishing cost-sharing among M.E., the Division, Provincial Jobs Funds and the local community. The funded position is reduced to .5 in 1987-88 and is eliminated the following year. Coincidentally, a new Division-sponsored position is introduced this year - Coordinator of Volunteers. By 1991 the Division will have four Community Liaison Programs operating and expects no cost sharing with M.E.

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS

That M.E. fund .5 staff at $13,750 based on $1,250 for 11 months.
Final report to be submitted April 15, 1988.

Manitoba

Education

Inner City Initiatives

124 King Street
Winnipeg, Manitoba CANADA
R3B 1H9

DATE: May 20, 1986

REGION: Urban

SCHOOL DIVISION: St. Vital S.D.#6

SCHOOL: Victor Mager

RENEWAL: X

NEW:

PILOT:

REQUEST: $28,600

PROJECT: Community Worker

FILE NO: PR-SD6-180

ADJUDICATION PANEL COMMENTS/CONTINGENCIES/RECOMMENDATIONS:

That M.E. fund Year 2 to a maximum of $27,000 for personnel ($26,000) and materials ($1,000) contingent upon the Division submitting a formal evaluation plan for Year 2 by June 30, 1986. That to facilitate the adequacy of the design of the evaluation, the project staff be asked to attend an evaluation workshop presented by M.E. in the Fall/86. That final evaluation to be submitted April 15, 1987. That Division begin to consider future funding possibilities. That Year 2 evaluation address assistance to staff in developing community school focus. The panel applauds the cooperation developed with other programs in this area and encourages the staff to continue this involvement.

HOLD FUNDS

RECOMMENDATION: $27,000

PP SD6 [illegible]
5-10

RECEIVED
APR 15 1987
MANITOBA EDUCATION
INNER CITY INITIATIVE

COMPENSATORY GRANT APPLICATION

from

THE ST. VITAL SCHOOL DIVISION NO. 6

April, 1987

Submitted by:

A. Boyes
Deputy Superintendent
St. Vital School Division

on behalf of
Victor Mager School
Victor Wyatt School
Lavallee School

Background

The St. Vital School Division No. 6 has been the recipient of compensatory grants from Manitoba Education in the past. Our first grant, for a Counsellor position at Lavallee School, resulted in the position becoming a permanent one at the school.

Our recent grants have been for Community Liaison Workers, first at Victor Mager School and last year at Victor Wyatt School. The former grant runs out in August, 1987, while the latter hopefully will be extended into its second year for 1987-88.

This request for further consideration of compensatory grant funding for the community liaison worker concept is based on our interest in seeing a model developed by which this concept can be transferred to other similar schools and community areas in the Winnipeg area.

Rationale

Three years of experience with this type of program in our two schools has provided us with solid evidence of the tangible values community liaison workers can bring to a school and its catchment area. The evaluations done have shown the positive impact on the school communities these programs have had.

The basic thrust of this proposal is for the continuation of the compensatory grants for two (2) Community Liaison Worker positions to expand the concept and benefit to a third school in 1987-88 and to a fourth school in 1988-89, using the same two school Community Liaison Workers we now have in place. Further, this request proposes to develop a model for the development of this type of program in other school areas. Lastly, the request suggests a long range funding process which would see the gradual shift of funding from Manitoba Education to the School Division.

The Proposal

The basic proposal to the Compensatory Grants Committee is as follows:

1. That Manitoba Education continue to fund two (2) Community Liaison Worker project positions in the St. Vital School Division.
2. That the funding of these two positions be phased out by Manitoba Education and assumed by the St. Vital School Division and the local community as per the attached funding model.

.../2

3. That the St. Vital School Division develop a model for the portability of the Community Liaison Worker concept and field test this model at Lavallee and Ashworth Schools.

The project and the model are based upon the following phases:

Phase 1: A Community Liaison Worker (CLW) is in place and establishes program and recruits volunteers from the community.

Phase 2: The CLW trains a Co-ordinator of Volunteers who would become responsible for ongoing recruitment and assignment of volunteers at the school.

Phase 3: Gradual withdrawal of direct service by the CLW, increased on-site co-ordination of program by the Co-ordinator of Volunteers, and a gradual phasing in of the Program Co-ordinator.

Phase 4: Volunteer Co-ordinators to be at each school site with one Divisional Program Co-ordinator to be responsible for program development and evaluation, training of Co-ordinator Volunteers and fund raising and other related duties.

The Funding Model

The attached chart suggests how the funding for the proposal could be managed. There are four contributors to this proposal with Manitoba Education completing its commitment to it by 1990.

The St. Vital School Board has given a commitment in principle to the proposal and the funding model. Further, the 1987 Budget has within its structure the means to carry out the financial obligations indicated in the attached chart.

Summary

The benefits to two school communities of the Community Liaison Worker have been demonstrated to us with positive results.

The four schools (three in existence: Victor Mager, Victor Wyatt and Lavallee, and the fourth, on the Ashworth school site, to be ready for occupancy in the Fall of 1988) are part of a common socio-economic area of our Division (see map). Many of the students now attending both Victor Wyatt School and Victor Mager School will form the nucleus of the new Ashworth School.

.../3

Further, we see spin-off benefits such as the following from the expansion of this concept.

1. There will be employment creation for local individuals.
2. There will be opportunities for individuals in the community to develop their marketable skills and become more employable.
3. There will be intangible benefit of having members in our community of enhancing their self-worth through volunteerism.
4. There will be opportunities to utilize students in various faculties at the University in research projects, volunteer programs and data base gathering.

The Last Word

We sincerely hope that you will give our proposal your serious consideration.

We would be pleased to provide any additional information you may require. Please call me at my office (257-7827) at any time.

Boyes

A. BOYES
Deputy Superintendent

on behalf of
Victor Mager School
Victor Wyatt School
Lavallee School
St. Vital School Division

/st

cc: Trustees
R. Kangas
H. Christie
M.L. Huot
G. Gartrell
Z. Steggles

ST. VITAL SCHOOL DIVISION NO. 6
COMPENSATORY GRANT APPLICATION
April, 1987

COMMUNITY LIAISON FUNDING MODEL

	SCHOOLS				FUNDING GROUPS			
Year	Victor Mager School	Victor Wyatt School	Lavallee School	Ashworth School	Manitoba Education	St. Vital School Div. No. 6	Jobs Fund etc.	Local Community
1985	1.0 CLW				1.0			
1986	1.0 CLW	1.0 CLW			2.0			
1987	.5 CLW 1.0 CV	1.0 CLW	.5 CLW		2.0	.5 CV	.5 CV-	--->
1988	1.0 CV	.5 CLW 1.0 CV	1.0 CLW*	.5 CLW	2.0	1.0 CV	1.0 CV-	--->
1989	.5 Prog. Co-ord.		.5 CLW	1.0 CLW	2.0	1.5 CV	.5 CV	1.5 CV
	1.0 CV	1.0 CV	1.0 CV	1.0 CV				
1990	1.0 Program Co-ordinator			.5 CLW	1.0	.5 Pr Co-ord	.5 CV	2.5 CV
	1.0 CV	1.0 CV	1.0 CV	1.0 CV		1.0 CV		
1991	1.0 Program Co-ordinator					1.0 Pr Co-ord	.5 CV	3.5 CV
	1.0 CV	1.0 CV	1.0 CV	1.0 CV				

* N.B. Also Program Co-ordinator for Victor Mager School

		Approx. Salary (Annual)
PC =	Program Co-Ordinator	$30,000
CLW =	Community Liaison Worker	$30,000
CV =	Co-ordinator of Volunteers	$10,000

NORWOOD SCHOOL DIVISION NO. 8

ARCHWOOD SCHOOL

COMMUNITY LIAISON WORKER

PR-SD8-164

SUMMARY SHEETS FOR PROJECT SUBMISSIONS

REGION: Urban Non-Winnipeg
M.E. STAFF PERSON: Jack King
SCHOOL DIVISION: Norwood S.D. #8
SCHOOL: Archwood

COMMUNITY-SCHOOL LIAISON

DESCRIPTION OF NEED

Previously established. Closing of Canada Packers will have an adverse effect on community and employment. Single Parents - 37%, Migrancy - 24%.

PROGRAM OBJECTIVE

This program has a target population of parents and students identified by need or referral in school (K-8) for which counselling service is provided directly or in conjunction with other agencies.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

1. To provide support to parents to enhance parenting skills.
2. To establish and maintain assistance to students with specific needs.
3. To increase parental communication with and involvement in school.
4. To promote and encourage positive activities involving students and parents in the community.

One full-time Community Liaison Worker funded by M.E. staffs the program operating out of Archwood School.

RESUBMISSION
PROJECTS REQUESTING 3RD YEAR FUNDING

PROGRAM EVALUATION SUMMARY
(All funding requests for projects ending Year II should include a copy of the completed evaluation.)

Enrolment has increased slightly from 1985-86 (149 to 156) as has the number of student contacts (30% to 35%) and parent contacts (20% to 31%). The total number of family contacts is 48. Many referrals have been made to social service agencies involving parents and students. Programs offered in school: Student R.A.P., STEP, Separation and Divorce Group (6 children grades 1-3). Positive response from agencies, parents/guardians, students and teachers. There is a small return rate of parent/guardian survey forms (12), students (24).

ACTUAL COST 86/87

ME Contribution		**Division Contribution**	
Materials:	$1,000	**Materials:**	
Personnel:	$22,000	**Personnel:**	

REQUESTED BUDGET 87/88

ME Contribution		**Division Contribution**	
Materials:	$500.00 ($200.00 P.D.)	**Materials:**	
Personnel:	$26,730.00	**Personnel:**	

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS: $27,230.00

COMMENTS/CONTINGENCIES

Program has developed into mainly counselling and crisis intervention, indicating a strong need for qualified counsellor. Home-School Liaison has become secondary. M.E. has encouraged more home visitation and more use by the school of existing community support services in the area of adult counselling. Community needs are apparent and ongoing.

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS

That M.E. fund .5 Community-Liaison Worker $12,500($1,250/mth.) for ten months with report submitted April, 1988. Funding contingent upon submission of revised plan which establishes community outreach as the primary objective. M.E. encourages a Division submission in Fall/87 for .5 guidance counsellor.

Manitoba

Education Inner City Initiatives

124 King Street
Winnipeg, Manitoba, CANADA
R3B 1H9

DATE: May 20, 1986

REGION: Urban

SCHOOL DIVISION: Norwood S.D. #8

SCHOOL: Archwood

RENEWAL: X

NEW:

PILOT:

REQUEST: $32,860

PROJECT: Home-School Liaison

FILE NO: PR-SD8-164

ADJUDICATION PANEL COMMENTS/CONTINGENCIES/RECOMMENDATIONS:

That M.E. fund the second year to a maximum of $23,000 to increase the staff position to a full-time 10-month term (salary $22,000 based on $26,000/year) and $1,000 for expenses. That funding is contingent upon the Division submitting the evaluation plan for Year 2 by June 30, 1986 and that to facilitate the adequacy of the design of the evaluation, the project staff be asked to attend an evaluation workshop presented by M.E. in the Fall/86. That final evaluation to be submitted by April 15, 1987. That program encourage participation of parents in the King George V Toy Lending Library. The Panel applauds the cooperation developed with other projects in this area and encourages this involvement. That the Division give consideration to the ongoing funding of the program.

RECOMMENDATION: $23,000

HOLD FUNDS

NORWOOD SCHOOL DIVISION NO. 8

KING GEORGE V SCHOOL

COMMUNITY LIAISON WORKER

PR-SD8-137

SUMMARY SHEETS FOR PROJECT SUBMISSIONS

REGION: Urban-Non-Winnipeg
M.E. STAFF PERSON: Jack King
SCHOOL DIVISION: Norwood S.D.#8
SCHOOL: King George V

Community-School Liaison

DESCRIPTION OF NEED

Established need previously.
Single Parent - 37%; Migrancy - 18%
Closing of Canada Packers will have an adverse effect on the community and employment.

PROGRAM OBJECTIVE

To provide educational and informational support to parents that enhance parenting skills and that focus on (K-3) students and families.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

1. To enhance the physical, intellectual and language development of (K-6) children.
2. To provide additional human resources to foster greater parental involvement in the education of their children.
3. To help the school provide contact with the home.
4. To provide an information network between home and school.
5. To involve parents and community in the school.
6. To promote and encourage positive activities in the community.
7. To coordinate the efforts of the school with other social agencies.

A full time Community Liaison Worker funded by M.E. coordinates the program and staffs the Parent Tot Drop-In Centre for Parents and Toy-lending Library.

RESUBMISSION
PROJECTS REQUESTING 3RD YEAR FUNDING

PROGRAM EVALUATION SUMMARY
(All funding requests for projects ending Year II should include a copy of the completed evaluation.)

After-school program run by eight parent volunteers. October - March involved between 40 and 15 students per month. The Toy Lending Library attracted between 90 and 40 students (September - March) monthly. The Parent Tot Drop-In Centre attracted between 10 and 30 parents (September - March) monthly. Parents, students and agencies support the program generally. While the majority of teachers support the continuance of the program several were not supportive. Many referrals have been made involving parents. Sixteen parent volunteers were active in school. Twelve workshops offered over the year.

ACTUAL COST 86/87

ME Contribution		**Division Contribution**	
Materials:	$2,000.00	**Materials:**	$1,000.00
Personnel:	$22,000.00	**Personnel:**	

REQUESTED BUDGET 87/88

ME Contribution		**Division Contribution**	
Materials:	$500.00 ($200.00 P.D.)	**Materials:**	
Personnel:	$26,730.00	**Personnel:**	

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS: $27,230.00

COMMENTS/CONTINGENCIES

Aide could manage Toy Lending Library and assist in the operation of the Parent-Tot Drop-In. This would enable the Community Liaison Worker to be out in the community more often with parents and establishing links to other social service agencies. Division appears indifferent to the program.

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS

That M.E. fund .5 community liaison worker ($12,500 based on 10 months at $1,250/mth.) and .5 community aide ($5,000). Funds contingent upon submission of a revised evaluation plan, job descriptions for the positions, and confirmation of the hiring of an aide from the community. M.E. encourages the Division to match funding for the community liaison worker position. Evaluation report to be submitted April 15, 1988.

Manitoba

Education

Inner City Initiatives

124 King Street
Winnipeg, Manitoba CANADA
R3B 1H9

DATE: May 20, 1986

REGION: Urban

SCHOOL DIVISION: Norwood S.D. #8

SCHOOL: King George V

RENEWAL: X

NEW:

PILOT:

REQUEST: $30,000

PROJECT: Home-School Liaison

FILE NO: PR-SD8-137

ADJUDICATION PANEL COMMENTS/CONTINGENCIES/RECOMMENDATIONS:

That M.E. fund the second year to a maximum of $24,000 increasing the staff position to a full-time 10-month term (salary $22,000 based on $26,000/year) with $1,000 for expenses and an additional $1,000 for equipment for the Toy Lending Library. Funding contingent upon: 1) Division matching the $1,000 for the Toy Lending Library; 2) confirmation that the centre will be open for a minimum of two hours each day; 3) Division submitting Year 2 evaluation plan by June 30, 1986. That to facilitate the adequacy of the design of the evaluation, the project staff be asked to attend an evaluation workshop presented by M.E. in the Fall/86. That the staff encourage parents to take an active part in the development of the centre with assistance from M.E. staff. That the final evaluation be submitted April 15, 1987 and that the Division give consideration to the ongoing funding of this project.

HOLD FUNDS

RECOMMENDATION: $24,000

SEVEN OAKS SCHOOL DIVISION NO. 10

MARYMOUND

TRANSITION PROGRAM

PR-SD10-23

SUMMARY SHEETS FOR PROJECT SUBMISSIONS

REGION: Urban Non-Winnipeg
M.E. STAFF PERSON: Jack King
SCHOOL DIVISION: Seven Oaks No. 10
SCHOOL: Marymound

Transition to a Second Chance

DESCRIPTION OF NEED

Previously established - and by the nature of the institution.

PROGRAM OBJECTIVE

To coordinate and facilitate the re-integration of Marymound School students into the community school system.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

A .5 staff person funded by M.E. provides support to students identified for transition into community schools. Staff visits the potential receiving school and conferences with relevant educational and support staff. Staff works with the student, using materials from the receiving school to prepare him/her for the transition. Student phases into new school with constant support provided by transition coordinator.

RESUBMISSION
PROJECTS REQUESTING 3RD YEAR FUNDING

PROGRAM EVALUATION SUMMARY
(All funding requests for projects ending Year II should include a copy of the completed evaluation.)

Students reintegrated into community schools - 25;
Transitioned into Marymound - 11;
Currently in transition program (March/87) - 6.

ACTUAL COST 86/87

ME Contribution Materials:		**Division Contribution Materials:**	
Personnel:	$13,800	**Personnel:**	$13,800

REQUESTED BUDGET 87/88

ME Contribution Materials:		**Division Contribution Materials:**	
Personnel:	$14,100	**Personnel:**	$14,100

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS: $28,200

COMMENTS/CONTINGENCIES

The program changed greatly over its two years. There were changes in administration and project personnel that were managed well, minimizing the effect on the program.

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS

M.E. staff recommends funding for two years at $14,100 per year for .5 transition coordinator position. Interim report to be submitted by April 15, 1988 and an evaluation report April 15, 1989.

Manitoba

Education

Inner City Initiatives

124 King Street
Winnipeg, Manitoba, CANADA
R3B 1H9

DATE: May 20, 1986

REGION: Urban

SCHOOL DIVISION: Seven Oaks S.D. #10

SCHOOL: Marymound

RENEWAL: X

NEW:

PILOT:

REQUEST: $13,332

PROJECT: Transition to a Second Chance

FILE NO: PR-SD10-23

ADJUDICATION PANEL COMMENTS/CONTINGENCIES/RECOMMENDATIONS:

That M.E. continue to fund .5 staff position ($13,300) and $50/month mileage expenses($500). That M.E. funds be used for students returning to core area schools only and that Marymound be encouraged to continue to contribute monies to expand the position to work with non-core students. That funds are held until receipt of Year 2 evaluation plans by June 30, 1986 and that to facilitate the adequacy of the design of the evaluation, the project staff be asked to attend an evaluation workshop presented by M.E. in the Fall/86. That final evaluation to be submitted April 15, 1987.

HOLD FUNDS

RECOMMENDATION: $13,300

NEW PROJECTS

NEW PROJECTS

PROJECT	DIVISION/SCHOOL	FUNDED 86/87	REQUEST 87/88	RECOMMEND	PAGE #
Bridge	Brooklands St. James #2		$ 54,500	-	6-2
Community-Liaison	Lavallee St. Vital #6		$ 15,000	$ 13,750	6-5
Guidance/Liaison	Princess Margaret River East #9		$ 33,000	$ 32,500	6-8
Marginal Students	Bertrun E. Glavin River East #9		$ 21,000	-	6-13
Guidance	Sherwood River East #9		$ 20,000	-	6-16
Behavior Assistance	Margaret Park Seven Oaks #10		$ 54,700	-	6-19
Alternative Program	Park Circle Transcona #12		$ 68,000	-	6-24

ST. JAMES-ASSINIBOIA SCHOOL DIVISION NO. 2

BROOKLANDS SCHOOL

BRIDGE FUNDING

PR-SD2-402

SUMMARY SHEETS FOR PROJECT SUBMISSIONS

REGION: Urban-Non-Winnipeg
M.E. STAFF PERSON: Jack King
SCHOOL DIVISION: St. James S.D.#2
SCHOOL: Brooklands

BROOKLANDS' BRIDGE

DESCRIPTION OF NEED

Earlier funding and 1981 Census Tract Data establishes need. Student mobility rate 30%. Native Students 22.8%. Single-Parent families 30%.

PROGRAM OBJECTIVE

1. To provide direct language intervention to targetted student (K-4).
2. To increase oral language competency in the classroom and in social communications.
3. To increase the effectiveness of clinical and resource effectiveness.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Daily small group sessions for (K-4) students identified through testing. Daily language lessons taught by the speech and language clinicians, resource teacher and aide. Regular weekly reports will be made to the parents along with suggested home activities to reinforce concepts. Feedback sheets for parents will be used to ensure and encourage communication with the school on program effectiveness.

FOR NEW PROJECTS ONLY

YEAR I EVALUATION PLANS

- Regular staff and program personnel meetings.
- Feedback from parents using a send-home survey form (weekly).
- Objective test score measures.
- Direct observation of in-class performance of students.

RESOURCES REQUIRED

ME Contribution		**Division Contribution**	
Materials:	$8,500.00	**Materials:**	-
Personnel:	$46,000.00	**Personnel:**	-

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS: $54,500.00

COMMENTS/CONTINGENCIES

Division has assigned higher priority to other recommended projects.

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS

M.E. staff recommends not to fund the project at this time.

ST. VITAL SCHOOL DIVISION NO. 6

LAVALLEE SCHOOL

COMMUNITY LIAISON WORKER

PR-SD6-39

SUMMARY SHEETS FOR PROJECT SUBMISSIONS

REGION: Urban Non-Winnipeg
M.E. STAFF PERSON: Jack King
SCHOOL DIVISION: St. Vital No. 6
SCHOOL: Lavallee

Community-School Liaison

DESCRIPTION OF NEED

Census Tract Data - 1981 - previously established need. The school has been funded for an Elementary Guidance position in 1985-86 through the Compensatory Support Program.

PROGRAM OBJECTIVE

To assist in the development of a Community School Concept by providing a Community Liaison Worker who will assist the school and provide leadership in the community.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

1. To identify, develop and provide educational, leisure and social services with primary attention given to students of the school and their parents.
2. To provide opportunity for community participation in planning and evaluating services and programs.
3. To cooperate with other community and government agencies and schools in coordinating services to the community.
4. To provide educational opportunities for post-secondary students.
5. To maintain links with other agencies through participation and assistance in project related research.
6. To adopt research findings enhancing the development of the program.
7. To create an environment conducive to the successful implementation of the program.

The Compensatory Grant provides for the services of one full-time Community Liaison Worker.

FOR NEW PROJECTS ONLY

YEAR I EVALUATION PLANS

To be developed in conjunction with Victor Mager School.

RESOURCES REQUIRED

ME Contribution		**Division Contribution**	
Materials:		**Materials:**	
Personnel:	$15,500	**Personnel:**	

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS: $15,500 ($500 travel allowance)

COMMENTS/CONTINGENCIES

The program is part of a Division plan to phase in a Community School concept by 1991 that will be sustained from Division funds and those resources available to the community.
(See Funding Model following page 5-10)

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS

That M.E. fund .5 staff at $13,750 based on $1,250/mth.
Interim report to be submitted by April 15, 1988 and an evaluation report by April 15, 1989.

RIVER EAST SCHOOL DIVISION NO. 9

PRINCESS MARGARET SCHOOL

ELEMENTARY GUIDANCE/COMMUNITY-LIAISON

PR-SD9-396

SUMMARY SHEETS FOR PROJECT SUBMISSIONS

REGION: Urban-Non-Winnipeg
M.E. STAFF PERSON: Jack King
SCHOOL DIVISION: River East S.D.#9
SCHOOL: Princess Margaret

DESCRIPTION OF NEED

Dual Track English/German school as well as ESL for the immigrant population of the Division. Of the 587 student K-6 - 41% English, 59% German track. ESL - 11.4%, 36% are from multiple housing projects, 11% to single parent families, 20% mobility rate.

PROGRAM OBJECTIVE

To better meet the needs of children academically, emotionally, socially, physically and creatively by offering elementary guidance and community liaison support.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

*An Elementary Guidance Counsellor would offer classroom and individual counselling, assist in developing specific programs such as personal safety and child advocacy. Descriptors of the role: counselling coordinating and consulting with students, teachers, parents and other service agencies.

* Community Liaison Worker - develop leadership skills among students and adults, develop and maintain communication liaison between program leaders, school personnel, community and agencies.
- develop awareness of the school system and community among parents of diverse cultures
- maintain and develop liaison with other service and ethnic organizations
- act as a therapeutic agent with families through mediation and training.

FOR NEW PROJECTS ONLY

YEAR I EVALUATION PLANS

See Attached.

RESOURCES REQUIRED

ME Contribution		Division Contribution	
Materials:	-	**Materials:**	
Personnel:	$33,000.00	**Personnel:**	

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS: $33,000.00

COMMENTS/CONTINGENCIES

This program has higher Division priority than B.E. Glavin and Sherwood.

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS

That M.E. recommend funding to a maximum of $32,500 (.5 Elementary Guidance at $20,000 and .5 Community Liaison at $12,500 based on 10 months at $1,250). An interim report will be submitted by April 15, 1988 and a final evaluation report by April 15, 1989.

EVALUATION (Specifics)

1. Recorded regular consultation with administration to discuss common concerns and priorize cases. Conferences to sometimes include students, family members, agency members and other staff members.
2. Recorded monthly meetings of administration and staff : C.G.C. resource, community liason, counsellor to review cases and explore ways of assisting each other.
3. Recorded regular conferences with resource teacher. school psychologist, liason worker and social workers to coordiate service needs, noting students who need more than one service. Cooperative connection maintained with C.F.S.
4 Recorded attention to families in need of counselling help - increasing involvement of these families through community liason worker and counsellor... In the counselling process of students or in referral to agencies.
5. Recording planned small and large group activities with students i.e. attention to types of groups and orientation e.g. on task behavior, attitutional focus, peer group support.
6. Record types of specific discussion groups co-led with support staff or teachers re problem solvers, separation.
7. Recording of co-counselling sessions done with psychologist or social worker.
8. Recording of professional development sessions in the area of family counselling learned helplessness, child sexual abuse, etc.
9. Recording planned liason with parents on both counsellor and community liason workers part through articles for newsletter, participation in staff meetings, attendance at community events.
10. Recording parent and community professional development on part of both re: child, sexual abuse, etc.
11. collection of statistical data i.e.
    - number of student interview
    - number of teacher contacts
    - number of principal contacts
    - number of parent contacts
    - number of consultation meetings - with C.G.C. and other support staff.

12. Staff survey form at conclusion of program
13. Parent survey form at conclusion of program.

PROGRAM REQUEST

Funding for 1/2 time Guidance Counsellor (20,000) and 1/2 time community liason worker (13,000).

RIVER EAST SCHOOL DIVISION NO. 9

BERTRUN E. GLAVIN SCHOOL

MARGINAL STUDENT PROGRAM

PR-SD9-398

SUMMARY SHEETS FOR PROJECT SUBMISSIONS

REGION: Urban-Non-Winnipeg
M.E. STAFF PERSON: Jack King
SCHOOL DIVISION: River East S.D.#9
SCHOOL: B.E. Glavin

MARGINAL STUDENT PROGRAMS

DESCRIPTION OF NEED

558 (K-6) students of whom 95 are targeted as Marginal Students from the (K-3) level. Of these students 20% migrancy, 45% subsidized housing, 42% single parent, 27% unemployed, welfare 11%.

PROGRAM OBJECTIVE

To better meet needs of children with ability who are dysfunctioning at school as described by River East Marginal Student program criteria.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

A. .5 Special Education teacher works cooperatively with teachers of marginal students (80%) and the remainder (20%) of the time directly with students.

Role description includes: coordinating, planning meetings, cooperatively planning I.E.P.S., monitoring/evaluating progress, recording, modifying programs, staff development plans, follow-up plans with children.

FOR NEW PROJECTS ONLY

YEAR I EVALUATION PLANS

1. Monthly student performance review.
2. Referrals monitored to Resource and Counselling.
3. Summative reports to parents by regular report card.
4. Support program monitored and evaluated by teachers led by administration.

RESOURCES REQUIRED

ME Contribution		**Division Contribution**	
Materials:		**Materials:**	$5,550.00
Personnel:	$21,000.00	**Personnel:**	

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS: $26,500.00

COMMENTS/CONTINGENCIES

This proposal has lower Division priority than Princess Margaret.

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS

That M.E. not fund at this time.

RIVER EAST SCHOOL DIVISION NO. 9

SHERWOOD SCHOOL

ELEMENTARY GUIDANCE PROGRAM

PR-SD9-397

SUMMARY SHEETS FOR PROJECT SUBMISSIONS

REGION: Urban-Non-Winnipeg
M.E. STAFF PERSON: Jack King
SCHOOL DIVISION: River East S.D.#9
SCHOOL: Sherwood

Elementary Guidance

DESCRIPTION OF NEED

152 (K-6) students: 36% single parent families, 19% unemployment, 37% low income level of parents, 8% bused, 17% day care. Variety of caretakers results in inconsistent expectations of appropriate behavior.

PROGRAM OBJECTIVE

To better meet the academic, social, physical and emotional needs by providing .5 Elementary Guidance Counsellor.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The counsellor would work cooperatively with other staff to provide support to targetted students individually and in small groups; to plan professional development activities for administration and staff; coordinate referrals to support services and to be an advocate for children generally.

FOR NEW PROJECTS ONLY

YEAR I EVALUATION PLANS

- develop support teams of administration, counsellor, parents, staff and special needs consultant
- monitor referrals, student behavior through survey and observation
- survey of parents
- regular reports from Assistant Superintendent in charge of Special Needs.

RESOURCES REQUIRED

ME Contribution		**Division Contribution**	
Materials:	-	**Materials:**	
Personnel:	$20,000.00	**Personnel:**	

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS: $20,000.00

COMMENTS/CONTINGENCIES

This is a lower Divisional priority than Princess Margaret and B.E. Glavin at this time.

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS

M.E. staff recommends not to fund at this time.

SEVEN OAKS SCHOOL DIVISION NO. 10

MARGARET PARK AND VICTORY SCHOOLS

BEHAVIOR ASSISTANCE CENTRE

PR-SD10-400

SUMMARY SHEETS FOR PROJECT SUBMISSIONS

REGION: Urban-Non-Winnipeg
M.E. STAFF PERSON: Jack King
SCHOOL DIVISION: Seven Oaks S.D.#10
SCHOOL: Margaret Park/Victory

DESCRIPTION OF NEED

Margaret Park - 244 (K-6) students: single parent families 16%,
Victory - 232 (K-6) students 13%.

PROGRAM OBJECTIVE

To establish a centre for the behavioral dysfunctioning student with intensive intervention provided by the teacher and aide.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

See Attached.

FOR NEW PROJECTS ONLY

YEAR I EVALUATION PLANS

Surveys and interview parents, teachers, administrators and resource personnel.
Statistics per student relating to time in the program and progress reports.
Staff development/Professional Development plans in development.

RESOURCES REQUIRED

ME Contribution		**Division Contribution**	
Materials:	$7,200.00	**Materials:**	$2,500.00
Personnel:	$47,500.00	**Personnel:**	$7,500.00

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS: $64,700.00

COMMENTS/CONTINGENCIES

The program advocates a withdrawl program and schools do not necessarily qualify as exhibiting city characteristics.

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS

M.E. staff recommends not to fund at this time.

Goals of the Program

1. To provide an environment which will facilitate the development of appropriate social skills. Children would be given the opportunity to apply these skills in the classroom, the lunch room, on the playground, and in the community.

2. To provide an environment which will enhance the child's self-concept.

3. To teach children appropriate communication and problem-solving skills.

4. To develop life skills.

5. To provide an academic program geared to individual needs.

6. To provide ongoing counselling for the child:

- to help in interactions with other children, staff members and family;
- to help the child know and understand himself/herself.

7. To provide ample opportunities for the child to engage in physical activities such as skating, swimming, roller skating. The purpose of these activities would be:

- to relieve stress;
- to teach children skills and activities which would enable them to participate in an acceptable manner with their peers - both at school and in the community;
- to enhance self-concept.

8. To consult with parents to develop strategies which will enable the child to function appropriately.

9. To help classroom teachers better understand and cope with children with behavior dysfunctions.

10. To develop a Staff P.D. plan regarding emotionally disturbed children.

11. To work toward complete re-entry of the child into the regular classroom.

12. To help students take control of and responsibility for their own behavior.

13. To work toward developing intrinsic motivation as students begin to experience success in their interactions with each other and success in their academic program.

Criteria for Student Selection

The basic criteria for student selection would be:

- priority given to students who are considered dangerous to themselves or others in the school, and who require intensive intervention.
- the student's inability to function appropriately in the regular classroom setting due to behavior dysfunctions. This behavior is severely detrimental to the learning and emotional well-being of others and interferes with the teaching of the class.
- the student's failure to respond to a number of different strategies employed to alleviate the situation, including the involvement of resource personnel.

TRANSCONA-SPRINGFIELD SCHOOL DIVISION NO. 12

PARK CIRCLE SCHOOL

PR-SD12-387

SUMMARY SHEETS FOR PROJECT SUBMISSIONS

REGION: Urban Non-Winnipeg
M.E. STAFF PERSON: Jack King
SCHOOL DIVISION: Transcona-Springfield No. 12
SCHOOL: Park Circle

Park Circle Alternative

DESCRIPTION OF NEED

132 (Grade 6-9) students: 17% wards of NEW FACESS, 20% single parent families, 13% unemployment, 33% subsidized housing.

PROGRAM OBJECTIVE

To add a therapeutic component to the present special school program to help troubled adolescents modify home and school behavior so they may return to the mainstream of school life.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

All students would be received following school referrals and be enrolled at Park Circle for one semester. Two positions are sought: a Home Liaison Worker with Social Work/Psychology background and a Child Care Worker certificated from Red River Community College.

The Liaison Worker - sets up therapeutic plans based on testing, psychological assessments and observation;
- provides treatment for students and establishes home contact by providing information on home dynamics;
- coordinates community resources to student/family.

The Child Care Worker - provides academic support;
- helps supervise students isolated;
- provides liaison between home/school and teacher/student when occasion is warranted.

FOR NEW PROJECTS ONLY

YEAR I EVALUATION PLANS

- Measuring through pre/post-standardized testing and observation student performances;
- Record-keeping meetings/conferences on cases and student in-class performances
- Survey/interviews of parents, students, teachers and clinic personnel.

RESOURCES REQUIRED

ME Contribution		**Division Contribution**	
Materials:	$2,000	**Materials:**	
Personnel:	$66,000	**Personnel:**	

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS: $68,000

COMMENTS/CONTINGENCIES

The school is currently receiving special needs funding to ensure a low P.T.R. and to provide additional resource support personnel. Though the program promotes withdrawal, it realistically builds on transition planning to reintegrate these at-risk students. There is a Learning Assistance Centre in Transcona-Springfield School Division No. 12.

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS

M.E. staff recommends not to fund at this time. Further, the Division should be encouraged to develop the home-liaison component for a funding proposal submission that has a cost-sharing component reflected in the type of therapeutic support detailed in this proposal.

SPECIAL GRANTS

ST. BONIFACE SCHOOL DIVISION NO. 4

MARION SCHOOL

SCHOOL PRIDE PROGRAM

PR-SD4-382

Manitoba

Education

Inner City Initiatives

124 King Street
Winnipeg, Manitoba, CANADA
R3B 1H9

DATE: January 19, 1987

REGION: Urban

SCHOOL DIVISION: St. Boniface S.D.#4

SCHOOL: Marion School

RENEWAL:

NEW:

PILOT: X

REQUEST: $11,068.50

PROJECT: Marion School Pride Program

FILE NO: PR-SD4-382

ADJUDICATION PANEL COMMENTS/CONTINGENCIES/RECOMMENDATIONS:

This after-school program will be administered by a governing Board committed to seeking revenue from Parks and Recreation, private business and service organizations in order that the program established through the Pilot grant will continue after Manitoba Education's funding concludes. The objectives are: 1. To build and enhance school/community pride at Marion School. 2. To foster relationships among students that provide a better understanding towards each other and the community. 3. To provide the opportunity for students, not presently enrolled in after-school activities, to participate. 4. To provide an outlet for students to grow socially and emotionally. Recommended funding of $4,655.00 as follows: $2,400.00 materials and $2,255 costs for part-time supervision and fee for service costs contingent upon: 1. Priority being given to community involvement in all aspects of the project; and 2. That the Project Board submit a statement of expenditures and report at the conclusion of the project.

RECOMMENDATION: $4,655.00

OTHER INFORMATION

OTHER INFORMATION

PROJECT	PAGE #
Manitoba Education - Evaluation Activities 1986 - 87	8-2
Free Stage for Youth - King George V Norwood #8	8-20
Personal Safety Program - Seven Oaks #10	8-25

MANITOBA EDUCATION

EVALUATION ACTIVITIES

1986 - 87

Topic 1: Evaluation Workshops (Non-Winnipeg No. 1)
October 6/10, 1986 Britanny Inn
November 25, 1986 St. Boniface Teacher Centre

Three 1/2 day workshops were held. All Division funded through Compensatory Grants were invited to participate. Represented were: St. James-Assiniboia School Division No. 2, St. Boniface School Division No. 4, St. Vital School Division No. 6, Norwood School Division No. 8, River East School Division No. 9, Seven Oaks School Division No. 10 and Transcona-Springfield School Division No. 12.

Workshops facilitators and planners were: Paul Madak, Anne Jefferson, Susan Fonseca, Jack King and Suni Matthews. Please see the attached summary evaluations for the workshops.

Topic 2: Community-School Liaison Program Evaluation.

Tenders were invited from six consulting companies on the evaluation of six community school liaison projects operating in four urban school divisions. An Evaluation Committee advisory to M.E. was struck with 2 representatives from St. Vital School Division No. 6, Norwood School Division No. 8, River East School Division No. 9 and Transcona-Springfield School Division No. 12. Carole Basarab represented the board of the Community Education Development Association (C.E.D.A.) and Jack King, Manitoba Education (Chairperson).

The Working Margins Consulting Group (Jeremy Hull and Greg Salinger) were selected to conduct the evaluation. They have submitted a detailed plan (see attached) and have been introduced into the divisions.

Topic 3: Elementary Guidance Evaluations

Tenders shall be issued to six firms by June, 1987. An Evaluation Committee is struck consisting of representations from St. James-Assiniboia School Division No. 2, St. Vital School Division No. 6, River East School Division No. 9, Seven Oaks School Division No. 10 and Jack King, Manitoba Education (Chairperson)

The selection of the external evaluator will occur by June 30, 1987. The actual start-up of the evaluation is scheduled for September, 1987 with a final report submitted by June, 1988.

Manitoba

Education

Inner City Initiatives

124 King Street
Winnipeg, Manitoba, CANADA
R3B 1H9

DATE: September 19, 1986

REGION: URBAN

SCHOOL DIVISION: St. Vital School Division No. 6

SCHOOL:

RENEWAL:

NEW:

PILOT: X

REQUEST: $4,000.00

PROJECT: Evaluation Workshop

FILE NO: PR-SD6-360

ADJUDICATION PANEL COMMENTS/CONTINGENCIES/RECOMMENDATIONS:

That M.E. fund $4,000.00 for three half day workshops on methods of program evaluation to be held in October and November for Compensatory Support project staff and evaluators.

RECOMMENDATION: $4,000.00

*Summary
Based on 19 returns

EVALUATION WORKSHOP

October 6, 10, 1986

Brittany Inn

Please rank the following items by circling the relevant number.

Scale: 1 Inadequate 2 Fair 3 Satisfactory 4 Very Good

5 6 8
1. Facilities (room, parking, refreshments) 1 2 3 4
"Poor parking" - 8 comments "Refreshments"
"Room" - 1 too cool/2 O.K. -2 favorable/good.
-1 more healthy fare e.g. Orange Juice

11 7
2. Expectations of Adjudication Panel member (Anne Jefferson) 1 2 3 4
"Relevant information" - 1
"Too technical" - 1

5 14
3. Evaluation Structure (Paul Madak) 1 2 3 4
1 - Excellent 1 - "Useful Information"

3 7 8
4. Homework Assignment 1 2 3 4
2 - Excellent idea

11 7
5. Writing up Results and Conclusions 1 2 3 4
1 - Good idea

6 13
6. Discussion Groups 1 2 3 4
1 - Excellent 1 - Very Helpful

If offered again:

a) What should be retained from this year's workshop?

b) What should be changed, dropped and/or added?

Do you have suggestions to make regarding activities that could meet your evaluation needs in a follow-up (November) workshop?

If offered again:

a) What should be retained?

Expectations of panel (4)
Evaluation Structure (3)
Homework Assignment (2)
Small group (7)
Results and Conclusions (2)

- Specifics given by Anne/Paul
- Good format - leaders
- Liked step by step walk through
- Good material
- Homework helped focus on parent involvement

b) What should be changed?

- meet in P.M.
- too much time commitment

be dropped?

- question period (2)

be added?

- more specific examples
- more handout material prior to speaker, presentation
- scoring techniques for questionnaires/interviews
- how to word questions

other comments

- more people need to hear Anne Jefferson
- poor parking

Suggestions for November follow-up

- provide a concrete model for evaluation and proposals (2)
- small group activity - share previous completed projects including samples of evaluation instruments.
  - review tentative plans for future reports.
  - review questions/concerns.
- keep prodding to get evaluations in ahead of time.
- hold it in the afternoon.

Evaluation Workshop
November 25, 1986
St. Boniface Teacher Centre

Please rank the following items by circling the relevant number.

Scale: 1 - Inadequate 2 - Fair 3 - Satisfactory 4 Very Good

			1	9
1. Facilities (room, parking, refreshments)	1	2	3	4
		1	4	5
2. Anne Jefferson - Presentation	1	2	3	4
			3	7
3. Paul Madak - Presentation	1	2	3	4
		2	5	3
4. Discussion Groups	1	2	3	4
		1	2	7
5. Wrap-up	1	2	3	4

A. Do you have concerns or questions that you would like to share? Please list below, on the back or on separate sheets as needed.

. Need more guidelines
. the package
. time spent on evaluation
. more useful strategies for developing parent involvement

B. Manitoba Education staff are provided to assist project staff in planning and development. With respect to evaluation what role should M.E. staff have?

. appreciated direction of staff to date
. networking opportunities they provide
. more feedback useful
. sharing information gleaned from others' evaluations
. being available/accessible
. critique drafts of reports
. assist with report format
. currently excellent

C. Should there be follow-up to this workshop? What form should it take? Who should be involved and when?

. not sure

. maybe in March, 1988 and by meeting in selected groups with Anne/Paul

. not really as long as Jack/Susan keep helping

Manitoba

Education Regional Services

116 — 1200 Portage Avenue
Winnipeg, Manitoba, CANADA
R3G 0T5

DATE: November 18, 1986

REGION: Urban

SCHOOL DIVISION: Norwood S.D.#8, River East S.D.#9, Transcona-Sprinfield S.D.#12, St. Vital S.D.#6

SCHOOL:

RENEWAL:

NEW: X

PILOT:

REQUEST: $15,000

PROJECT TITLE: Evaluation: Home-School Liaison Program

FILE NO: PR-SD6-381

ADJUDICATION PANEL COMMENTS/CONTINGENCIES/RECOMMENDATIONS:

Panel recommends that M.E. fund a 2 year evaluation of Home-School Liaison projects funded through the Compensatory Support Program to commence January, 1987, with an interim report submitted by October 15, 1987, and final report submitted by October 15, 1988.

First year funding in the amount of $15,000.

RECOMMENDATION: $15,000

April 29, 1987

HOME-SCHOOL LIAISON PROGRAM EVALUATION

WORK PLAN

General Overview

The set of activities listed below represent the planned evaluation activities for the Home-School Liaison Program. These are sequenced for planning purposes, but some deviation from the planned dates may be expected. We anticipate that meetings will be called by the Evaluation Committe or by ourselves at points when we have reached project reporting stages, when we require guidance for the next stage of evaluation work, or when the Committee feels the need to raise a concern or receive updated information from the evaluators. We understand that the first such meeting has been scheduled for May 27, 1987, at which time we hope to have had meetings with each project (principals, coordinators, and parent committees) and to have a literature review and draft data collection forms to be discussed and finalized.

Throughout this project, and particularly in the early planning and consultation with projects, we intend to minimize duplication of effort with the individual project evaluations which have been taking place independently from this evaluation of the overall program. Where possible we will utilize and build upon data collected for these evaluations, and if it seems appropriate, discuss possible joint data collection efforts with project staff. Our objective will be to conduct an efficient evaluation exercise, to allow for more direct contact between us and parents, and to avoid over-saturating the school staff and parents with data collection requests.

The telephone survey is described much as it was in the earlier draft of this work plan. However, we will be more strictly limiting the time devoted to this activity, particularly on the part of the two principal evaluators, and will rely more heavily on our assistant(s) to carry out this survey, after having had initial training from us. In other words, the telephone survey will receive less emphasis, but will be conducted in a methodical and rigourous manner to try to improve the validity and reliability of the data which is collected. As an additional way of improving the quality and quantity of responses to this survey, we will request that principals and project staff help publicize and explain the purpose of the telephone survey prior to its being implemented.

We appreciate the distinction the Evaluation Committee has made between the role of the evaluators in raising issues which arise from the evaluation activity, and the role of the school divisions, the project steering committees, and the Evaluation Committee as decision-makers. We expect to address the issue of clarifying project objectives and operationalizing them as we proceed with the design of evaluation activities and data collection instruments. This may result in questions from us to project committees (to be raised during meetings with projects). We anticipate drafting a set of operational objectives based on each project's stated objectives, and distributing this to project coordinators and committees for their reaction and amendment. This will be part of the design of data collection instruments (activity 3 below). These operationalized objectives will then become the basis for much of our work, and will be reassessed during the preparation of the Interim Report and the Final Report, and during the one-day workshops at which these reports are to be presented.

Activity	Period or Completion Date
1. Preparation of Revised Work Plan	April 30, 1987

Revised work plan to be prepared following direction received from the Evaluation Committee, and to be distributed to Committee prior to May 1. Revisions to be made as necessary.

2. Preparation of Literature Review	May 22, 1987

Computer search to be initiated along with a manual search of documents held in local libraries and among interested groups and individuals in Winnipeg. Documents to be assembled, reviewed, and the results to be prepared in written form as a stand alone document. Literature review will focus on the issues of:

- Educational performance and community participation;
- Evaluations of community schools and community participation programs;
- Conceptual or philosophical issues underlying program design; and,
- How programs are designed differently to achieve differing objectives.

The literature review is expected to support analysis of the programs to be done for the interim and final reports, and to be of use to project staff as an educational and background document.

April 29, 1987

3. Design of Data Collection Forms

First Draft -
May 8, 1987
Final Draft -
May 22, 1987

A series of data collection instruments will be designed to serve the various elements of the data collection process. These will include:

a) Interview guides for our in-person interviews with principals and home-school coordinators;

b) Questionnaires for teaching staff;

c) Questionnaires for staff of other closely related community agencies;

d) Questionnaires for a telephone survey of parents;

e) Check list of project data and records required;

f) Particicpant evaluation forms for use in workshops or other project events.

These will be presented in draft form to the Evaluation Committee and discussed prior to being presented to parent - school councils or committees. (See below.)

4. Project Meetings

May 11-22, 1987

The first meetings with the project committees are seen as the key first step in establishing a process for the ongoing evaluation. We plan to arrange a meeting with each of the six projects during mid-May. At these meetings we will introduce our planned evaluation activities, clarify our approach and objectives, and discuss the roles that different people will play in the process. We are hoping that these meetings will result in an understanding of the particular emphases of different projects, and help us revise our data collection instruments and methods accordingly. Project staff and committee members will have an opportunity to review the data collection forms and suggest changes, and to advise us as to what data collection and evaluative activity has already taken place. These project meetings will also be used to plan the timing of future data collection activities.

April 29, 1987

5. Interviews with Principals and Coordinators May 25-29, 1987

At the initial project meetings (above) a schedule will be set for interviews to take place at each school with the principal and home-school liaison coordinator. The interviews will be dovetailed with distribution of questionnaires to teaching staff and collection of project data and documents so that information can be assembled as efficiently as possible. The evaluators will avoid repeated interviews and trips to the schools so as not to place too great a time demand on school staff. These interviews will take place at the end of each of the two school years (1986/87 and 1987/88).

6. Telephone Survey of Parents or Other Target Groups June 1-10, 1987 &
June 1-10, 1988

Assuming that the key target groups of the projects will vary from one project to another, a telephone survey method will be used to sample the appropriate groups. This survey will be timed to take place near the end of the second year of operation for each project. Therefore, some communities will be interviewed in 1987, and some in 1988. If the project is directed towards all parents, then a list of parents' telephone numbers will be requested from the school and telephone interviews will be conducted from a random sample of this group. If there are key groups among the parents as a whole who are being targetted, such as the parents of students whose first language is not English, or families living in a new residential development, then these particular sub-groups will be sampled more intensively. Issues of appropriate ways of approaching parents, protection of confidential student or family information, and the particular questions to be asked will all be cleared with the school administration and with the parent-school committee involved prior to being implemented. There will be one or two research assistants hired to help conduct the telephone interviews, and these assistants will be given appropriate training. Where as a result of consultation with the project staff and committee it is felt that special language capability is required, the research assistant will be hired with this in mind.

April 29, 1987

7. Project Data

May 11-29, 1987 &
May, 1988

As noted above the availability of project documents and records will be identified in discussion with school principals and project staff during our initial meetings. The types of data we expect to obtain include:

a) Project proposals and annual reports;
b) Data on student attendance/lateness, student turnover and withdrawals, and possibly other student performance data if available;
c) Planning documents for the home-school liaison projects, particularly where there is an emphasis in the projects on planning;
d) Evaluation reports and evaluation data where this is not included in annual reports;
e) Activity schedules for projects, both for activities which have already occurred, and planned future activities;
f) Data on project staff qualifications and backgrounds;
g) Project staff job descriptions;
h) Descriptions of parent-school committee structures and terms of reference;
i) Records of numbers of participants in various types of project activities;
j) Project outputs, such as newsletters, curriculum materials, community education materials, etc.
j) Any other documents or information that is identified in discussion with principals and staff which might be of assistance in the evaluation.

We will have a check list of the types of information we are looking for with us when we first meet the parent-school committees and principals, and will discuss data availability and collection methods at this time.

8. Census Data

June, 1987 &
June, 1988

A profile of each project catchment area will be assembled from 1981 Census data, identifying any project target groups within each area, and providing a general picture of socio-economic conditions and demographic characteristics. This information will be assembled by June, 1987 for the benefit of project staff and committees who may be engaged in planning activities. It will be based on boundaries identified by the schools, in comparison with Census Tract boundaries. Data for these geographic areas is available from Census publications, Census microfiche, from the City of Winnipeg, and from the Winnipeg Core Area office.

1986 Census data, however, will not be available until the end of 1987 for Winnipeg Census Tracts. Once this is available, it will be obtained on a consistent geographic basis with the 1981 Census data, and a profile of how the different project catchment areas have changed over the period will be assembled. Where some of this analysis has been done or is going to be done by projects, the evaluators will simply provide supplementary information as required.

9. Participant Evaluation Data

May, 1987 -
May, 1988

Project coordinators will be asked to distribute and collect short participant evaluation forms at project events, based on consultations with coordinators and principals, and based on information as to planned events and activities. These forms will be designed to help identify who the participants are in these events, and what their views are of the project and of the specific event they have attended.

In addition, the evaluators will participate in selected events, in consultation with coordinators and principals, to interact with and gain a first-hand impression of participants feelings about the program. This involvement will include participation in at least one project event per project. The events may be previously planned events or specially arranged meetings for evaluative purposes, depending on what approach would provide the most appropriate exposure to parent/community participants. This will be determined through consultations with project coordinators and principals.

10. Year I Analysis

June, 1987 -
August, 1987

This analysis will consist of assembling and analysing the various types of information obtained to June, 1987. The analysis will result in initial findings concerning the projects, and will incorporate information from the literature review and the socio-economic profiles of the project areas. The projects will be described and compared/contrasted in terms of their structure, objectives, community characteristics, staffing, implementation, etc.

The report will be designed to provide a set of recommended actions to be taken over the coming year, which can be used by the Evaluation Committee and the individual project committees as planning documents if they should so wish.

11. Interim Report October, 1987

The interim report, incorporating the above analysis, will be presented to the Evaluation Committee for review and discussion. Based on this discussion revisions may be made. It will then be presented as part of a one-day planning workshop with representatives of each project and school. These representatives will be, primarily, project planners and decision-makers, as opposed to the general public. During this one-day event, the recommendations will be presented and discussed, and individual projects will be able to make presentations and share information concerning their own experiences and conclusions. The workshop will be designed to develop a set of targets and objectives to be achieved over the coming year. This will form the basis for a similar workshop when the final report is presented (see below).

12. Year II Analysis June, 1988 - August, 1988

Following data collection activities in year two as described above, an analysis of year II data will be carried out. This will update and round out the information in the year I analysis, and will lead to the preparation of a final report.

13. Final Report October, 1988

The final report will be presented in draft form to the Evaluation Committee at which time it will be reviewed and discussed. After appropriate modifications have been made it will be presented in a second one-day planning workshop for schools and project staff and committee members. This workshop will provide an opportunity for participants to assess their success during the second year of the evaluation in relation to the goals that had been established in the previous year, and again, to share their experiences and views with each other. Again, the workshop will lead to the identification of objectives and activities to be pursued during the coming year, in anticipation of a final workshop to occur in the spring of 1989. (See below.)

14. Final Workshop

April or May, 1989

The final workshop will be similar to the two earlier one-day workshops, except that no further evaluation or analysis will have been carried out in the interim by the evaluators. Rather, our role will be to facilitate a progress review and information sharing event which will reinforce the projects' own planning and developmental activities. Accordingly, time will be devoted to presentations from the different projects rather than presentations from the evaluators. The evaluators will be responsible for organizing the event and facilitating the discussion of progress over the previous year.

Date	Report/Activity	Payment
April 22, 1987	Work Plan	$ 2,000
May 22, 1987	Literature Review	2,000
October, 1987	Interim Report	10,000
October, 1988	Final Report	9,500
May, 1989	Follow-up Workshop	500
TOTAL		$24,000

Manitoba

Education

Regional Services

116 — 1200 Portage Avenue
Winnipeg, Manitoba, CANADA
R3G 0T5

DATE: November 18, 1986

REGION: Urban

SCHOOL DIVISION: Winnipeg S.D.#1, River East S.D.#9,
St. James-Assiniboia S.D.#2, St. Vital S.D.#6, Seven Oaks S.D.#10

SCHOOL:

RENEWAL:

NEW: X

PILOT:

REQUEST: $15,000

PROJECT TITLE: Evaluation: Elementary Counselling Program

FILE NO: PR-SD9-380

ADJUDICATION PANEL COMMENTS/CONTINGENCIES/RECOMMENDATIONS:

That M.E. conduct a comprehensive evaluation of Elementary Counselling projects funded through the Compensatory Support Program.

The evaluation will be developed over two school years commencing in September, 1987. An interim report will be issued by April 15, 1988 and a final report by April 15, 1989.

RECOMMENDATION: $15,000

NORWOOD SCHOOL DIVISION NO. 8
KING GEORGE V SCHOOL
FREE STAGE FOR YOUTH - INTERIM REPORT
PR-SD8-379

8-21

Manitoba

Education Regional Services

116 — 1200 Portage Avenue
Winnipeg, Manitoba, CANADA
R3G 0T5

DATE: November 18, 1986

REGION: Urban

SCHOOL DIVISION: Norwood No. 8

SCHOOL: King George V

RENEWAL:

NEW: X

PILOT:

REQUEST: $5,000

PROJECT TITLE: "Free Stage for Youth"

FILE NO: PR-SD8-379

ADJUDICATION PANEL COMMENTS/CONTINGENCIES/RECOMMENDATIONS:

Panel recommends funding $3,000 one year only contingent upon the Division securing the remaining $2,000 necessary for the implementation of the program and a final report with a statement of expenditures submitted at the conclusion of the pilot. No funding to be available for this program.

HOLD FUNDS

RECOMMENDATION: $3,000

Funding for "Free Stage For Youth - 1987" is being shared by Manitoba Education, the Norwood School Division, King George V Parent Teacher Association and Archwood School. The funding provided will be used to host six concerts in the library theatre of our school. The facilities in the school are ideal for the program. The cooperation from the professional entertainers helps provide a learning experience for students participating on stage. The cooperation from parents, staff and students provides those in the audience with an entertaining evening.

To date, Friday night concerts were held February 6th and March 20th. Please find attached a copy of the program from each of the concerts.

Arrangements are being made to line up professional talent and celebrity master of ceremonies for future concerts. Concerts are scheduled for: April 24, May 22, October 2 and November 13. Al Simmons who performed at Expo all last summer is expected to be part of the April concert. Expenses to date are within budget. We intend to complete the program on the same note.

When the program is complete a final report will be submitted to the Inner City Initiative Office. We believe the funds invested in this program will pay dividends in a variety of ways for many years to come.

FREE STAGE PROGRAM

Program Director - Bill Quinn

M.C. - Rocki Roletti - C.B.C. personality

1. The Blarney Band - This group has performed at children's festivals all over Manitoba and Canada. They feature Irish and Canadian folk songs. Make sure to get your hands clappin' and toes tappin'.
2. Matthew Craig - This grade 5 student will perform a song that compliments his interesting personality.
3. The Playground Sweethearts - This group of Grade 5 girls will sing the folk song "Country Roads"

INTERMISSION

4. The Three Kookaburras - These Grade 4 students will sing the Australian folk song "The Kookaburra"
5. The Grade 2 Singers - These Grade 2 students will sing some short songs.
6. The Midnight Hour Show - This "glowing" act performed by Grade 5 student Paul Krahn to the song "Axel F".
7. Grade Six Singers - This group of students will perform 2 partner songs - "Rufus Rustus and "Chicken"
8. Guitar Pickin'- Shane Lindsay will play 4 songs on his guitar - This Land, Marianna, Love Me Tender and Ode to Joy.
9. Ryan and Barbara will perform an Elvis Presley song.

Mr. Quinn would like to thank the Core Area Initiative Program, the Norwood School Division, The King George V P.T.A. and Archwood School for making Freestage '87 ppssible.

FREE STAGE PROGRAM

1) **Jaques Chenier**

Jaques is a singer/songwriter from St. Boniface who will sing us a selection of songs for children.

2) **Trisha and Adrienne**

These Grade 2 students will sing "The Chinese Fan" with costumes

3) **The Archwood Recorder Concert**

This group of Grade 5 students will play some songs on their soprano recorders.

INTERMISSION

4) **The Easy T's**

This local quartet will perform a selection of songs for you to sing along with.

5) **The Saltarelli Sisters**

This sister duo will perform the Canadian folk song "The Frozen Logger"

6) **Jeff's Comedy Show**

This Grade 6 student will present some jokes for us.

7) **Bob and Jim**

A little commercial about health benefits

8) **The Grade 5 Players**

A little play inspired by the new provincial budget.

SEVEN OAKS SCHOOL DIVISION NO. 10

PERSONAL SAFETY PROGRAM - INTERIM REPORT

PR-SD10-65

Manitoba

Education

Inner City Initiatives

124 King Street
Winnipeg, Manitoba, CANADA
R3B 1H9

DATE: May 23, 1986

REGION: Urban

SCHOOL DIVISION: Seven Oaks S.D.#10

SCHOOL: Division Wide

RENEWAL:

NEW: X

PILOT:

REQUEST: $14,500

PROJECT: Sexual Abuse Prevention

FILE NO: PR-SD10-65

ADJUDICATION PANEL COMMENTS/CONTINGENCIES/RECOMMENDATIONS:

That M.F. fund to a maximum of $8,000 contingent upon a submission of a reworked budget indicating costs directed to elementary and junior high.

That final evaluation be submitted April 15, 1987.

HOLD FUNDS

RECOMMENDATION: $8,000

PERSONAL SAFETY PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT

INTERIM REPORT

I INTRODUCTION

The Seven Oaks School Division No. 10 is currently completing its fourth year in the development and provision of a personal safety program for its students. The primary purpose of this program is to inform and educate children about what they can do to protect themselves against sexual abuse. The division's involvement is based on the beliefs that:

a. schools share with society a responsibility to combat a serious social problem, that of child sexual abuse; and provide a safe environment in which children can deal with the issue in a positive, comprehensive manner; and,

b. children can learn self-protective skills that reduce their vulnerability to assault; and can be provided with strategies for dealing with assault in such a way as not to place themselves in greater/further jeopardy.

The school division believes that the program has been a most valuable addition to its regular programs. Initial reports indicated that:

a. it has been well-received by children, teachers and parents - obviously meeting a perceived need;

b. it has raised the general awareness and sensitivity of the community and the school to a serious social problem;

c. the self-concepts of both students and teachers have been enhanced by involvement in the program;

d. teachers have become more sensitive to children's needs and the community's "helping" resources;

e. a number of students have received assistance, others have obviously avoided potentially dangerous situations and shared these with teachers; and

f. it has contributed to Seven Oaks School Division as being perceived as a "caring" school division and teachers being seen as responsive, responsible professionals. See Appendix A.

Initial feedback, continuing feedback, and a strong sense of purpose have encouraged us to expand and continue development of the personal safety program and supporting policy. The program has expanded from its starting base at the K-6 level into senior high; a policy to assist teachers in reporting suspected abuse cases has been developed; and we are continuing to develop our teachers' knowledge and expertise through ongoing professional development opportunities.

II CHRONOLOGY OF DEVELOPMENTS

Significant developments, in order of occurence, are listed below:

Early Fall, 1983 - Research on Actors' Showcase "Feeling Yes, Feeling No" Program.

December, 1983 - Board motion placing an amount for "Feeling Yes, Feeling No" Program in the 1984 Budget.

Spring, 1984 - March-June, 1984 - Actor's Showcase "Feeling Yes, Feeling No" Program conducted in all elementary schools.

June, 1984 - Establishment of a committee to recommend follow-up to the "Feeling Yes, Feeling No" Program.

Fall, 1984 - Committee research of various sexual abuse prevention programs.

Winter, 1984 - Committee recommendation to accept the K-9 Seattle Committee for Children Program:

K-6 Talking About Touching
7-9 Personal Decision Making

Spring, 1985 - Introduction of the program into schools: K-6 by teachers; 7-9 by guidance counsellors.

- Staff Training, Ann Downer, Director Seattle Committee for Children.

Summer, 1985 - Staff Training for Teacher Leaders: "Train the Trainer" session for four educators in Seattle.

Fall, 1985 - Orientation for new teachers by divisional trainers.

- Pilot program (three sessions) of Actors' Showcase - Junior-Senior High Program entitled "The Right to No".
- Policy discussion initiated on "Protocol for Reporting Child Abuse".
- Established a Divisional Personal Safety Program Committee with six scheduled meetings; open to all staff.

Winter, 1985	- Development of draft policy (currently under discussion by school administrators).
	- Ongoing professional development for teachers and schools.
	- Divisional Personal Safety Program Committee receives presentation by: Alex Laurence, Sexual Abuse Co-ordinator for North West Child and Family Service (Jan.); Norma McCormick, Manitoba representative on the Badgley Commission (Feb.).
Spring, 1986	- Work on draft policy continues.
	- Ongoing professional development for teachers and schools.
	- Representatives from Seven Oaks make presentations to River East and Western School Division.
Summer, 1986	- Staff training for Teacher Leader "Train the Trainer" session for one educator in Seattle (see Appendix E).
Fall, 1986	- Orientation for new teachers by divisional trainer; participants from Lord Selkirk and Assiniboine South School Divisions included (see Appendix F).
	- Ongoing professional development for staff continues at school level.
	- Divisional Personal Safety Program ((P.S.P.) Committee with each school represented continues (see Appendix G). Meetings held September, November, January, April and June. Sub-committee met as necessary to complete projects.
	- Project work at P.S.P. sub-committee level include: development of a teacher handbook, a program information brochure and the review instruments.
	- One representative attends Consultation and Response, an invitation workshop to deal with proposed changes to Federal Child Sexual Abuse Legislation and is a group discussion facilitator for educators.

Fall, 1986
(continued)

- Program resources - curriculums and support materials purchased.
- One representative from Seven Oaks along with other professionals from various disciplines, provide a half day workshop for Family Practice Residents at Kildonan Medical Centre on child abuse.
- Three representatives from Seven Oaks make a presentation to Transcona-Springfield School Division regarding program implementation and operation.
- Provide consultation for Assiniboine South School Division regarding the pilot of materials at the junior high level.
- One representative from Seven Oaks provides a half day curriculum orientation for Assiniboine South School Division.
- Revisions of draft policy "Reporting Child Abuse" completed.
- Eight representatives from Seven Oaks provide input during an inter-divisional session to the Child Abuse Review Team appointed by the Honorable Muriel Smith.

Winter, 1987

- Divisional P.S.P. Committee projects (handbook, brochure and review instruments) continue on schedule.
- Policy "Reporting Child Abuse" established (see Appendix D).
- Two representatives from Seven Oaks provide a full day inservice (scope of child abuse and curriculum orientation) for K-8 teachers, counsellors, administrators, superintendent, school trustees of Western School along with local social workers and R.C.M.P. officers in Morden.
- Six representatives attend a full day workshop with Dr. Laura Mills, sponsored by Winnipeg and Assiniboine South School Divisions on helping the abused child.
- Two evening parent information sessions held at two school locations.
- One representative from Seven Oaks along with other professionals from various disciplines provide a half day workshop for Family Practice Residents at Kildonan Medical Centre on Child Abuse.

Winter, 1987 (continued)	- Provide consultation assistance to St. Vital School Division regarding implementation and development of a program.
	- Two representatives attend local Child Abuse Forum sponsored by the Junior League of Winnipeg.
Spring, 1987	- An evening presentation by one representative from Seven Oaks for the parents with children in the Tyndall Park Day Nursery Program.
	- Committee projects (handbook, brochure and review process) on schedule.
	- Large scale review of program scheduled. Raw data collection to occur in May with final report ready in September, 1987.
	- Handbook for teachers to be printed for distribution in September, 1987.
	- Program brochure to be printed for distribution in September, 1987.

III KEY CONSIDERATIONS

One of our first tasks in follow-up to the "Feeling Yes, Feeling No" Program was to find a program, based on the same principles, which our teachers could endorse and implement. After considerable exploration and review, our committee recommended and the Board accepted the program developed by the Seattle Committee for Children: (A kit is provided for perusal.) K-6 "Talking About Touching and 7-9 Personal Decision Making. We believe the program to be well planned; and relatively easy for teachers (K-6) and guidance counsellors (7-9) to implement and integrate into their classrooms with a minimum of training. The program has integrity as a program and provides a sound base for educating our teachers, our second major consideration.

Our teacher inservicing has several components:

1. general awareness - all elementary teachers have had at least two days of inservice on sexual abuse - identification, responsibilities, roles of teacher, extent of problem, and the like;
2. specific program education - every elementary teacher and each guidance counsellor has received at least one half day of training in use of the materials;
3. orientation for new teachers - new teachers received one half day of training in the use of the materials in the fall of 1985; new teachers received a full day of training in the fall of 1986.
4. trainer education - four educators have taken a week long intensive training session in Seattle (1985), the purpose of which was to prepare them to educate our teachers; a fifth educator has taken the same intensive training session (1986).

We have found our teachers to be most receptive and eager to integrate this program into their teaching - we attribute this, in large part, to successful teacher education.

A third concern is community involvement.

Participation by parents (see Appendix B) and child caring agencies; and communication with the community (see Appendix C) are built into our overall program as an integral part. To that end, we keep an open dialogue with child caring agencies and individuals, particularly as school administrators; we inform our parents regularly about the program through school newsletters; and we use our Divisional Newsletter to keep the community up to date on developments. One service organization, the Kiwanis, has taken a particular interest in the program - they have funded some materials and requested a report of program status for information purposes.

In terms of funding, the Board covered the complete cost of the initial program, as per Appendix A. However, during the past two years, a large portion of the cost has been covered by Manitoba Education in the form of compensatory program funding.

One other major area of activity was the area of policy development. A policy of reporting child abuse has been developed and was adopted by the Board (see Appendix D). Policy discussion provided very worthwhile exchange between school administrators, child caring agencies and the P.S.P. committee - school administrators, in particular, have learned much from the process.

IV CURRENT STATUS OF PROGRAM/POLICY

A. Program - Committee for Children; Seattle
K-6 - "Talking About Touching"
7-9 - "Personal Decision-Making""

B. Policy - Reporting Child Abuse
Adopted January, 1987

C. Survey - Scheduled for May, 1987 (see Appendix H)

V CONCLUSION

The personal Safety Program is a particularly important and worthwhile addition to our educational program in Seven Oaks School Division; and one which is bound to receive our continued support.

To complete this in-progress evaluation report, the following sections will be forwarded by September 30th, 1987:

I Overview of Review Process
II Review Highlights
III Recommendations
IV Budget Summary
V Conclusion